



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines


Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



EX LIBRIS







THE LARGER SOCIALISM



THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK • BOSTON • CHICAGO
DALLAS • ATLANTA • SAN FRANCISCO

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED
LONDON • BOMBAY • CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, Ltd.
TORONTO

THE LARGER SOCIALISM

BY
BERTRAM BENEDICT
"

LIBRARY OF
CONGRESS

New York
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
1921

All rights reserved

HX 86
1345

COPYRIGHT, 1921;
By THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
Set up and printed. Published May, 1921

TO THE
LIBRARY OF

Press of
J. J. Little & Ives Company
New York, U. S. A.

To
My Mother
and
My Father

451325




TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION—SOCIALISM AND MATERIAL WEL- FARE	1
CHAPTER	
I. SOCIALISM AND QUALITY OF PRODUCTION . .	9
II. SOCIALISM AND QUANTITY OF PRODUCTION . .	32
III. SOCIALISM AND GUILD SOCIALISM	57
IV. SOCIALISM AND THE MARXIAN CAST OF THOUGHT	95
V. THE SOCIALISTS AND THE WAR	127
VI. SOCIALISM AND THE ETHICAL APPEAL . . .	161
VII. SOME CONSIDERATIONS CONCERNING SOCIALIST POLICY	188
VIII. THE LARGER SOCIALISM	217

THE LARGER SOCIALISM

THE LARGER SOCIALISM

INTRODUCTION

SOCIALISM AND MATERIAL WELFARE

THE Socialist remedy for the ills which confront society is, of course, the public ownership and the democratic management of all industry of social value. On the whole, the answer is definite and positive. True, the Socialist ranks harbor various opinions as to what constitutes democratic management. One camp maintains that the socially-valuable industries, after becoming publicly-owned, should be operated by the Government. Another camp, feeling more impellingly the call of syndicalism and guild socialism, would have the publicly-owned industries operated primarily by their workers. The sudden apparition on the horizon of an actually-functioning Soviet system has caused within the Socialist citadel disagreement also as to whether the political state should be organized geographically or occupationally, and as to the method by which Socialism

can be or should be achieved. Finally, there is room for legitimate Socialist disagreement as to the gauge or gauges by which an industry shall be considered socially-valuable.

Nevertheless, in all fairness it must be admitted that these points lie in the periphery and not at the hub of the Socialist wheel. Concerning the central conception of Socialism, there is substantial agreement. As at present the national Government owns and operates the mails, the Panama Canal, the Alaskan Railroad, the army and navy, the postal savings banks, the parcel post, the Government Printing Office, the Lighthouse and Coast Guard Services, the national parks;—as local Governments own and operate public schools, libraries, the police and fire departments, the water supply, streets and bridges, roads, street illumination, parks,—so in a Socialist state the national Government and the local Governments would own and be responsible for the operation of the mines, the railroads, the iron and steel mills, the steamship lines, the express systems, the oil wells, the power plants, the clothing factories, the meat-packing plants, the shoe factories, the shipping, the laundries, the commercial automobile plants, the cotton and woolen mills, the forests, the non-agricultural land, the commercial and savings banks, the apartment houses, the grain elevators, the gas plants, the street railways, the insurance companies, the bakeries, the

telephone and telegraph systems, the cold storage plants, the department stores, the ice plants, the agricultural implements factories, the fertilizer plants, the sugar refineries, the paper mills, the fish-packing plants, the lumber mills, the flour mills, and all other agencies of production and distribution which cannot cease functioning, or cannot function badly, without inflicting injury upon the great majority of the people. As the present national and local Governments furnish mail service, education, water, and fire and police protection to the people free or at cost, and in the amounts necessary for the people's welfare, Socialist national and local Governments would furnish to the people free or at cost, and in the amounts necessary for the people's welfare, coal, oil, bread, meat, milk, ice, clothing, shoes, transportation, housing, sewing machines, calico, blankets, lumber, gas and electricity and insurance policies.

Side by side with this collective ownership and operation of all necessary industry, a Socialist state would enforce extensive welfare legislation. True, most of this legislation can be achieved by a purification instead of by the abolition of the present capitalist system, and much of it is advocated by ardent opponents of a Socialist system. But the consummation of most of these welfare proposals must be advocated by every Socialist, for even to those Socialists who would have the

Government intrude but lightly into the actual processes of production, much of this protective legislation will appear the sine qua non of a successful cooperative commonwealth. Among other things, it would include maternity insurance, for a period before and after childbirth; pensions for dependent mothers; abolition of child labor, except possibly in abnormal cases, below the age of eighteen; higher schooling for all showing mental promise, even by the aid of scholarships for the support of the students preparing for the more advanced professions, such as medicine; extensive vocational guidance; generally available medical examinations; the guaranty to each worker of at least the minimum wage necessary for him or for his family to maintain a socially-useful standard of living; a maximum wage for even the most responsible administrators of the Socialist state and of the Socialist state's industries, dependent upon the total wealth productivity of the state and upon the margin remaining after all had been guaranteed the minimum wage; health insurance; liberal laws for workmen's compensation in all industries; regulation, preferably variable, of the hours of labor permissible per day, per week, per year; liberal sanitary and safety regulations for all work, especially for the more unhealthful and the more dangerous; high, if not confiscatory, taxes on the wealth descending from the previous capitalist system, on inheritances, on the unearned

increment in land values; segregation of the feeble-minded; insurance against whatever unemployment might persist in spite of wide regularization of industry, against invalidity, against old age.

The outstanding virtue which most Socialists claim for this program is the abolition of the unhappiness due to the present inequitable distribution of material welfare. Concerning the virtues of any possible rearrangement of society's wealth looking toward such an end, there can be little dispute. At one end of our social scale, the few roll in wealth well-nigh beyond even their most extravagant desires, while at the other end the many stoop under poverty incapable of satisfying even their scantiest demands for a happy existence. At the top, many are enabled to enjoy life without performing irksome labor, or by performing labor of little value to the community; and at the bottom, by far the larger proportion of mankind is compelled to toil, whether on farm or in workshop, far beyond the point at which toil is satisfying, or self-developing, or even socially valuable. Until the more recent decades, it may have been true that production was insufficient for an equitable system of distribution of the world's material goods to meet the need of all; but current figures for the total national income of the United States show that the super-efficient machine production of the twentieth century

would more than suffice fully to pass material welfare around in this country.

It is difficult to do justice to the strength and validity of this indictment of our present system for permitting some to eat cake while others have not bread. Man may not live by bread alone, but he lives by bread first; and no civilization can be wholesome until to everyone living under it there is available a sufficiency of the goods which satisfy man's basic material needs. But my purpose is to insist that this program can only lay the foundation. Unless there is much building upon it, the full promise of Socialism will not be redeemed. A Socialist civilization in which the predominant human type will be the type of fairly prosperous skilled trade unionist most in evidence at an annual convention of the American Federation of Labor, for instance, will hardly repay the hopes, the idealism, the enthusiasm and the abiding sacrifices which have gone into the Socialist movement. The average skilled A. F. of L. trade unionist has by this time so increased his wages and so decreased his labor that economically he has become no longer a proletarian, but a bourgeois; but in the process he has become also intellectually, socially, ethically and emotionally a bourgeois. A society composed of nouveaux riches may be a more wholesome organism than a society composed of even the deserving poor; but the possibilities of the Cooperative Commonwealth far

exceed these of the mere creation of nouvelle richesse. Freedom from material want is the irreducible minimum for a healthy civilization, but it must be conceived as the means, not the end.

The thesis herein presented is that if Socialism is to benefit humanity to the full extent of which it is capable, it must become a broader and a deeper theory and political movement than at present. It must think and talk less in terms of giving the worker the full product of his labor, and more in terms of building a richer culture upon the foundation of material welfare. It must establish a working mental agreement with other theories and movements which will arrive at fruition after Socialism, if the Socialist state is to be rich instead of poor in the immaterial and finer products of the human mind. It must have an eye, for example, to the rights of the individual conscience, as against the custom of the herd; to the development of individual and collective mental independence and self-assertiveness; to the biological improvement of the race; to the negro problem; above all, to the feminist movement. It must become the creation of the most exacting empirical, contemporaneous and inductive thought, rather than of deductive and dogmatic dialectics based on thought-systems deriving from formulas wrought by past generations. It must be more deeply concerned with the quality than with the quantity of the enjoyments of life under

Socialism, even though it may never lose sight of the dependence of their quality upon their quantity. It must ceaselessly consider the nature of the ideals which will drive men forward in a Socialist commonwealth, with the concepts which will underlie the daily rounds of their existence, with the power of Socialism to encourage the few and weak social impulses and to discourage the many and strong anti-social impulses of which man is the combination. It must become less Socialistic and more socialistic. In a word, a Socialist state must ask, "What kind of man is Jones?" far more anxiously than it will have previously asked, "How much does Jones earn?"

CHAPTER I

SOCIALISM AND QUALITY OF PRODUCTION.

THE first and unavoidable responsibility of a Socialist state thus would be the improvement of the material fortunes of the great bulk of its subjects. To consummate such an improvement, there is naturally and inexorably demanded an adequate production of those goods on which the populace's material well-being depends. The first issue at stake between the capitalist system and a socialist system hence becomes the issue of comparative efficiency in producing essentials.

One would therefore naturally expect a respectable proportion of Socialist propaganda, both written and spoken, to concern itself with the productive efficiency of a Socialist commonwealth. True, it might be objected that in so far as the Socialist movement holds hard and fast to the Marxian analyses, any such concern would be largely superfluous, if not inappropriate. For Marxism teaches that the replacement of the capitalist system by the Socialist system is as inevitable as the replacement of the tadpole by the frog; so that discussion of the advantages of

Socialism over Capitalism, because of the former's greater productive efficiency, might be considered as much beside the point as discussion of the advantages of frogs over tadpoles. The prime duty of a Marxian Socialist movement from this point of view would accordingly seem to consist merely in educating the proletariat to a realization of this inevitability of Socialism, in preparing the workers against the day when they are destined to take over the reins of government and industry, and thus in hastening the dawn of, rather than in evolving, the Cooperative Commonwealth.

And yet even in so far as the Socialist movement holds to the Marxian analyses, it is glaringly neglectful of its opportunities if it does not stress the greater efficiency of Socialism over Capitalism in material production. It is thus neglectful in both its tactics and its thought, both as a political movement and as a system of economic and political philosophy. With respect to its tactics, it accepts as its duty and responsibility the education of the proletariat to the virtues of the Cooperative Commonwealth. It refuses to abandon the workers to the mercies of whatever education they might passively derive from the mere flow of events inevitably toward the Socialist state. But nothing could educate the still uneducated proletariat better than proof of the greater material productivity of Socialism over Capitalism. The Marxian believes that man acts predominantly

from economic motives, so that the most effective method of enlisting the workers under the red flag would be to persuade them that under Socialism there would be a greater abundance of material goods available to them than under Capitalism. If the Marxian insists that the workers will and must be educated only through the scarcity of the material goods falling to their lot as the capitalist system develops, the answer is that the workers can best be made to realize that scarcity by contrasting it with the comparative material abundance to be expected as a Socialist system develops. Even for a Marxian Socialist movement, insistence upon the advantages of Socialism over Capitalism for purposes of production thus would be tactics as effective as justifiable.

And in thought and philosophy, as well as in tactics and action, the compleat Marxian, of all persons, should be eager to prove that there would be greater abundance of material goods under Socialism than under Capitalism. For the keystone of the Marxian arch is the economic interpretation of history. True, the Marxian interpretation of history is not to be described as a mere assertion of the predominance of economic or materialistic motives in human life. It asserts rather that each era of human history centers inexorably around, and takes its cultural tone primarily from, the method of economic production and distribution current in that era. But cer-

tainly with such an interpretation of history the predominance of materialistic motives is closely connected. It may not be logically connected as an exact corollary, but it would seem to be at least implied, and implied more than loosely. It would seem difficult to maintain that each era of human history centers around its method of economic production, and at the same time to deny that each era of human history can serve itself best by adopting the method of economic production which in that era can most effectively meet the demand for economic or material goods. It is inconceivable that the Socialist commonwealth would supplant the capitalist state by the action of the working-class unless the working-class stood to obtain material improvement by the change.

Accordingly, even if the Socialist movement were predominantly under the dictation of the Marxian analyses, its failure to concentrate much, if not most, of its fire upon the comparative inefficiency of capitalist production would still be serious. But by this day and generation, the political Socialist movement, particularly in the United States, has begun to break with Marxism on one point after another. The 1920 Presidential platform of the Socialist Party of America, both in its statement of principles (*program maximum*) and in its immediate demands (*program minimum*), like its Congressional platform of 1918, is essentially revisionist. That is to say, it is more

representative of "evolutionary" than of revolutionary or Marxian Socialism. In the more recent decades since the *Communist Manifesto*, the Socialist movement, as a whole, has ceased to content itself with the generally negative indictment of the present-day structure of society which is involved in Marxism. As a whole, the Socialist movement no longer contents itself with indicting capitalism solely through the Marxian economic interpretation of history, explanation of crises, prophecy of the overwhelmingly accelerated concentration of capital, forecast of the increasing misery and pauperization of the workers, prediction of the ultimate disappearance of the middle class, class struggle doctrine, labor theory of value and surplus value creed. And as reliance upon the all-sufficiency of the Marxian analyses wanes, the importance of considerations of productivity obviously waxes supreme. Yet despite this increasingly evident unwillingness to accept Marx as the sum and substance of the Law, the delver into the American Socialist movement is met by much material on the iniquities of Capitalism and the virtues of Socialism in the distribution of wealth, but by an astounding paucity of sound discussion as to their comparative efficiency in the production of wealth. That paucity of discussion is more than astounding; it is illuminating. It irresistibly inclines the observer to conclude that the Socialist movement in the United

States has not yet thought its problem through, and has not yet fully appreciated the realities of the situation confronting it.

For whether the advent of Socialism be considered desirable because inevitable or inevitable because desirable, the Socialist can hurl against the capitalist system an indictment for inefficiency of production which, if emphasized and reiterated as the serious and fundamental nature of the indictment deserves and demands, might well prove to be Socialism's trump card. It is initially in the quality of its output that the capitalist system of production is weak and vulnerable. The capitalist system does not pretend to produce in order to satisfy needs; it produces solely to acquire profits. Where profits accompany the satisfaction of needs, well and good; where no profits accrue in satisfying needs, very regrettable, no doubt, but irremediable. The world may suffer because it has not sufficient houses and has more than sufficient silk shirts—the capitalist system does not produce houses if there be no profit in the production of houses, and it continues to produce silk shirts if there be profit in the production of silk shirts. Or even if there be profit in the production of houses, houses are not produced if there be greater profit in the production of silk shirts. Similarly, so long as transportation is furnished the nation according to the possibility of profits, so long will certain sections which need railroads

be deprived of them—just as there would be no Rural Free Delivery if the Postal System were a private profit-making and not a public service-rendering enterprise. And there is not only the production of relatively unessential goods and the lack of production of essential goods—there is also the production of goods per se harmful, such as patent medicines, so long as profit accrues to them. Society's resources today are more than sufficient to supply honey to some after all have been supplied with milk; but capitalism so utilizes those resources as to furnish honey as well as milk for some before it furnishes milk for all.

There is not only capitalism's inefficiency in the kinds of commodities produced; there is also its inefficiency in its effect upon most of the human beings producing under it. Unless prevented by welfare legislation or by organization of the workers, it utilizes them in hours, kinds and surrounding circumstances of labor which exhaust their energies prematurely. Where the task is of a nature to undermine the health of a human being engaged on it, although it might be performed also by machinery, the human being is kept at the task whenever it is cheaper to use him than to use a machine. If it be to the material profit of a steel mill to work men twelve hours a day, or in twenty-four hour shifts, or seven days a week, in unskilled labor where a reduction of hours would produce an increased output from them relatively,

but a decreased output absolutely, they are so worked. If workers can be obtained by paying wages so low as not to provide them with what are generally considered the mere decencies of life, they are so paid. If our present system of production had cared more deeply for the welfare of the nation as a whole than for the guaranty of profits to our few owners of property, the little children of the South would not have waited so long to be freed from the slavery of the cotton-mills, from which even now some of them have not yet been freed. Likewise, some of the horrors and the danger to our entire national stability from our negro problem would have been obviated by a greater willingness to provide respectable educational facilities for the negroes below the Mason and Dixon Line; more generously to train them in and to provide them with methods of earning a livelihood better than those now open to them; and to remove from them many of the political and trade-union disabilities which make their present economic exploitation possible.

Even if the worker be regarded merely as a factor in production and not as a human being, the capitalist system must plead guilty to using him inefficiently. As a mere machine, the worker would run more efficiently and in the sum total would produce more if capitalism could plan his years of service. But capitalism cannot. It is organized for profits, for the highest possible

profits and usually for profits quickly, not ultimately, realized. A few industries employing highly skilled labor may devote themselves to securing the maximum product from their workmen during the latter's lifetime, secure in the probability that most of the workmen will spend their lifetime of labor in those plants; but such industries are exceptional in the capitalist system. Similarly exceptional, on the whole, are those workmen who are not thrust into industry too early in life and too untrained, who are not worked too long or too hard, who are not subjected to wasteful periods of unemployment, and who are not paid too low wages to guarantee that their total actual lifetime product will closely approximate their total potential lifetime product.

Aside from the well-organized and skilled workers—whose number is hardly above the 4,000,000, or 4,500,000 membership of the American Federation of Labor and the few non-American Federation of Labor unions—the workers' potential resources of a lifetime are burned at both ends, and they are thrown on the scrap-heap years before an efficiently adjusted schedule of labor would dispense with their efforts. Especially rapid is the feeding of this human scrap-heap in those enterprises which are not well regulated by unionization; unionization is weaker among the women than among the men; and it is the women whose

strength should particularly be conserved for the welfare of the race. True, there is a steadily increasing amount of protective legislation for women, and for men in dangerous employments such as mining and match-making; but the fact remains that a systematically and nationally planned schedule of training for work, of vocational guidance, of wages, of regularization of industry, of housing, of recreation, for industry as a whole would see most workers produce far more in their allotted span than the capitalist system permits them to produce.

In 1919 and part of 1920, the employers of labor complained aloud from the housetops of a shortage of labor. In 1919 and 1920, however, there were men in their graves who would have been alive, working, had it not been for the havoc wrought on them by the devastation of too long, too hard, too early-begun, too irregular, too poorly-paid labor. There were others alive, but unemployable, who might have been employable. There were still others employed and at work, whose work in neither quantity nor quality was what it might have been under a more systematic and longer-range direction of industry and of industry's labor force than the capitalist system, by its very essence, is able to undertake.

There is not only this social inefficiency in capitalism's use of human material; there is also the inefficiency involved when many competing busi-

ness enterprises perform similar tasks that could be more efficiently performed by the more specialized processes of fewer non-competing, larger and more highly-monopolized business enterprises. Of course, the waste inherent in competition is most marked in the households of the land, with their thousands of individual adjacent kitchens and refrigerators and furnaces and washboards. But there is also the inefficiency of parallel railroads with coal-burning locomotives, where a separate system of electrification for each road would be less economical, but where a central system of electrification for several roads would be more economical. There is the inefficiency of hauling coal a thousand miles to a locality which could be served by coal mined five hundred miles away if the coal mines of the land were nationalized into a single producing and distributing system. And there is the costly inefficiency involved when the separate wagons of competing milk companies traverse the same streets of the same city, with the milk of one company transported from that company's milk depot on the west of the city to serve streets in the east, at the same time that the milk of a rival company is being transported from the latter's depot in the east of the city to serve streets in the west.

There is not only this inefficiency in the relations between our various business units; there is also the woeful inefficiency within a single busi-

ness unit in so far as it is engaged in a competitive field. Much of the effort of such a business unit is wasted in the mere process of gaining business from rivals, efforts which from the point of view of the maximum social production are doubly spendthrift. For not only might these efforts be utilized in increasing production, but also their expense is shifted to the consumer in the guise of increased cost of the commodities which are produced. From the social point of view, it makes no difference which of a half-dozen brands of clothing or shaving-soap or automobile tires the public consumes. The money and effort spent by the clothing, shaving-soap and rubber companies in persuading the men of the nation to buy one brand of clothing, shaving-soap or automobile tire instead of another are money and effort squandered while they might be utilized in producing larger supplies of the same goods or other goods. Similarly, there is the waste of money and effort represented in our extensive corps of travelling salesmen. Outside of whatever truly useful service they render in making adjustments and in furnishing details and information which cannot well be handled at long distance, their time and upkeep go to the mere juggling of sales to one business unit instead of to another, juggling which adds not a single cubit to the stature of the country's supply of the goods thereby sold.

There are not only these parasitical aspects of

business enterprises whose efforts are otherwise socially useful; there are also business enterprises which are wholly parasitical or even harmful. There are those advertising organizations which merely increase the expense of producing commodities, by conducting campaigns for the purchase of one brand instead of another. In so far as they relieve their clients from doing their own advertising, these organizations would fall under the category of the above paragraph; but they do more. By solicitation they bring into existence advertising which without that solicitation would never be born. Much of this artificially-created advertising has the effect of keeping alive business units which would serve the community better by dying, because they do not produce as cheaply and efficiently as their rivals. Not only would the death of inefficient business units thus kept alive by artificial respiration release the whole market for the goods produced most efficiently and cheaply, but also the very increase in size thereby made possible for the more efficient plants would in many cases enable the latter to increase their size so as to produce even more efficiently, and thus to sell their goods even more cheaply.

To an extent these advertising companies may often perform a real service in bringing a useful commodity before the public, such as safety razors at the time of their invention; but on the other hand they often inflict a real injury by inducing

the purchase of luxuries, such as a new limousine when the old one might well have served for another year; or by stimulating for a trip to Palm Beach the expenditure of money which might otherwise go to the relief of Vienna, where there die for the lack of a mere crust of bread thousands of children whose labor in the coming decades would be of priceless value in repairing the wreck of European industry and agriculture. Similarly, there are the lawyers who live by enabling corporations to indulge in practises which injure the body social as much as they enrich the corporations—a waste of much of the nation's best brain power; there are the stock-brokers whose chief effort lies in enabling respectable gamblers to buy and sell on margins, rather than in providing a market for necessary securities; there are the book-agents; there are the middlemen and jobbers who perform little or no indispensable service in facilitating the marketing of foodstuffs.

There is not only this wasteful lack of guidance over the kinds of goods and the quantities of goods which the capitalist system produces; there is also the cleavage between the two antagonistic camps in business which the capitalist system accentuates. When the relations between Capital and Labor become so strained that they eventuate in a strike or a lockout, that strike or lockout spells far greater inefficiency than all the inefficiency al-

leged for Government management or for workers' management in industry. An idle factory is the last word in futility, and a system which from time to time renders factories idle is the last word in a futile system. And even where the struggle of Labor to profit at the expense of Capital, and of Capital to profit at the expense of Labor, does not come into the open in the form of strikes and lockouts, it may and constantly does smoulder under the surface in the form of the least effort by Labor allowable (negative sabotage), wastefulness, carelessness, and unnecessary "vacations" from work—what the defenders of the present order call the refusal to give a full day's work for a full day's wage. Of course, it cannot be argued that the mere substitution of public for private capital in production means the complete end of strikes or of bad feeling between employer and employee—there is the example of the great strike on the French Governmental railways several years before the World War; and the present unorganized "outlaw" railway strike which is convulsing the United States as I write well might have been called several months previously, when the railroads were in the hands of the Government.

Nevertheless, much of the recalcitrancy of Labor today is due to the fact that it is arrayed against private instead of public Capital—the antagonism is often personal. For when Labor

downs tools in an enterprise pertaining to the Government today, it is apt to feel that it is striking in reality against private Capital. For such a Government enterprise is still the exception rather than the rule while most enterprises under that Government are still privately owned and still directed for private profit. It is another, and by no means the least, of the indictments against the capitalist system that under it such private enterprises have much to gain by controlling the political Government; and it is rarely that they are unable to resist the inducement. Where this business control of Government is not direct, it may function indirectly by creating in the Government, latterly largely through propagandizing of public opinion, a psychology favorable to the fortunes of the profit-makers. Often, of course, the business interests do not succeed in capturing the Government for their point of view, but they succeed often enough to preserve in Government Labor at present the feeling that in reality it is still capitalist Labor. The strikers on the French railways in effect were striking against capitalist employers; and in the United States, the Government operation of the railways was so manifestly temporary, and so manifestly on terms favorable to the private owners of the railways, that even if a railway strike had been called, it could hardly have been fairly considered a strike against a truly governmental enterprise.

There is not only the inefficiency of our scheme of producing; there is also the ludicrous inefficiency of the varying rate of speed at which most of our industry proceeds. There is little check upon over-production, there is little stimulation against under-production. Each business unit produces as it sees fit; it naturally produces most lavishly when profits are most lavish; when profits are most lavish in one field, they are apt to be most lavish in all fields; all business units are thus producing their maximum at the same time; there is no check to prevent that maximum from becoming more than the world in normal times can consume; hence one more factor works toward a business depression, and it is the country, not merely the worker, who suffers. And a country's economic extravagance in times of over-production can by no means balance its economic penury in times of under-production, any more than the hundred dollars which a man spends when his income is \$10,000 yearly can balance the hundred dollars which he spends when his income is \$3,000 yearly.

Furthermore, there is inefficient internal irregularity within many industries considered as individual industries—the investigation of the recent soft coal strike proved that most of the miners were employed eight hours a day during certain months of the year and were almost invariably “laid off” for other months of every

year. In other industries, the working year is composed of periods of hectic overtime, normal hours and dully habitual stagnation—a wasteful irregularity possible of mitigation in even the so-called “seasonal” industries. Again, there is nothing to prevent an industry from producing a limited supply of commodities at a large profit per unit instead of an extensive supply at a nominal profit per unit. Our economic processes are as unguided as the appetite of a child who eats all five boxes of his Christmas candy at one sitting and then must spend the next day in bed.

As against the inefficiency of this mode of production, inextricably inherent in the capitalist system, the Socialists would do well to dwell with the utmost insistence upon the cardinal point of efficiency in Socialist production. That point is the regularization of industry—regularization of kind of output, of amount of output and of method of output. True, a certain degree of such regularization is possible to capitalist industry. The trade union movement will grow apace, and its checks upon the exploitation of the worker will become sterner. Welfare legislation will be extended. Women will be protected more stringently. America may almost catch up to Europe in social insurance. The child labor limits will be raised and doubtless will be made national. Safety and sanitary regulations will be applied more strictly

by law and by trade union pressure, and workmen's compensation will be expanded to cover most, if not all, industries. Minimum wages may cease to recognize sex distinctions. Some less rusty and creaking machinery than at present available may reduce the number and extent of strikes and lockouts. The federal reserve banking system and the private bankers, possibly with the cooperation of the leaders of big business, may impose some slight checks upon over-production—and some slight stimulus against under-production. Competition conceivably will wane, and will be replaced by greater concentration, with increased efficiency, in industry; and there well may be imposed limits upon the percentage of profits to be gained by private business.

But even this highly sanguine program does not meet the main issue in efficiency of production as a Socialist program can meet it. Capitalism cannot compel its producers to move from the field of luxuries to the field of necessities if there be greater profit in luxuries than in necessities; nor can it drive its producers to enter fields, however essential to the public welfare, where there is no profit; nor can it impose upon its producers a ban on profitable over-production or a demand for unprofitable increase of production in periods of under-production.

Under Socialism, on the other hand, production would be guided by the public need, not by profits.

To each individual would be guaranteed a return from his labor sufficient to supply him with at least the material necessities of life incident upon the maintenance of a socially useful standard of living. The demand for these necessities would then practically coincide with the need for them. ("Practically," and not entirely, because a thoroughly wise expenditure of its income by the population could not be, as it ought not be, guaranteed.) The Socialist state would then recognize as the first lien upon it the production and distribution of the necessities of life to the extent to satisfy practically all the public needs for them.

After having seen to the production and distribution of the necessities of life, the Socialist state would turn to the semi-necessities. For the production of these, the amount of land, labor, capital and promoting and administrative skill left available might well demand consideration. The potential productivity immediately available, of course, would be increased by a number of factors. Thus, the production of goods directly harmful, such as patent medicines, might be flatly forbidden. Again, the land, labor, capital and organizing and administrative skill now utilized in competition between separate business units and within individual business units would largely become available for new positive and direct productivity. At all events, up to whatever point the Socialist

state might conceive essentials, semi-essentials and even quasi-essentials to end, and non-essentials to begin, the state would be responsible for production. (In practise, of course, it would be impossible to draw that line with any degree of dogmatism.) In addition, the producers of non-essentials would find it necessary or desirable to utilize much of the material evolving from Socialist production of essentials—for the printers and binders of de luxe editions, for instance, the leather from the state tanneries, supplied from the state slaughter-houses by hides from the cattle on the state ranches, as well as the paper produced (perhaps on order) from the state paper mills supplied by the state forests, would probably be found more economical than the privately produced leather and paper. On the state's side, the desirability of selling leather and paper to the private producers still existing, and even the permission to them to produce and to use leather and paper for and by themselves, would obviously depend upon the current plentifulness of, and freedom from fear of future shortage in, leather and paper.

The state industries of the cooperative commonwealth need not necessarily all become more highly centralized than certain of our big industries at present. Thus it might prove more efficient to utilize the present more or less separate organizations of the United States Steel Corpora-

tion, the Bethlehem Steel Company and Jones and Laughlin than to combine them. There might be centralization in certain aspects of buying ore and higher specialization in manufacturing certain steel products; but it might prove beneficial to the efficiency of the state industrial productivity under Socialism to encourage these separate steel organizations to compete with one another—competition to see which could best serve the public, not best serve itself at the expense of the public. The problem of food distribution would certainly have to be met by machinery almost as decentralized as Mr. Hoover's Food Administration during the World War, with its separate state food administrations. A similar system would probably have to be followed by the state dry-goods and other retail stores. Probably chiefly in the ordering and purchase of raw materials would complete amalgamation and centralization of the various producing and distributing units in one branch of the largest-scale industry be found the most efficient and economical system. There could be no adamant rule as to the extent to which higher monopolization and centralization than that at present obtaining under capitalism would be found more economical and the extent to which it would be found more costly.

Only, each industry would be guided with an eye to its welfare in the future—newsprint paper might be made even scarcer than at present in

order that it might become more instead of less plentiful in the next generation. Each industry would be managed at that varying rate of production which in a given season would not glut the market with its products nor fail to satisfy its market's legitimate demands. In addition, there would be correlative guidance between industry and industry—a bad corn crop in one year would see more land turned over to corn next year, possibly at the expense of tobacco; and manufactures would be speeded several months before the great harvest season and depressed during the great need for harvest labor and for freight-cars, so as to ensure for society the maximum agricultural acquisition from the crops available for acquisition. Finally, the state would conduct new enterprises which would promote the public welfare, even though it would prove impossible for them to meet their material expenses—the Rural Free Delivery principle applied, for instance, to the construction of railroads, or of gas and electricity plants, or of sewerage systems, or of hospitals, in sparsely-settled regions.

CHAPTER II.

SOCIALISM AND QUANTITY OF PRODUCTION.

To an extent, but only to an extent, the Co-operative Commonwealth can eat its cake and have it, too. To an extent, it can lower the number of its hours of labor without temporarily lowering production and increase wages without temporarily heightening the cost of commodities. For example, during the World War a ten-hour day in the British manufacture of munitions gave forth fewer and poorer munitions than the eight-hour day—not only fewer munitions per hour, but fewer in sum total. Great Britain similarly discovered that the munitions output of a seven-day week and a fifty-two-week year proved itself lower and poorer than the output of a six-day week and a fifty-week year, again not only relatively, but absolutely. There was nothing unprecedented in this discovery. Many a private manufacturer has found a decrease, voluntary or involuntary, in his plant's working-hours an aid, not a hindrance, to output. No element of production wreaks havoc comparable to that wrought by sabotage, and fatigue is a prime saboteur of industry.

But there are nonetheless limits upon the gains in production, or lack of losses in production, to be realized by the elimination of fatigue. Such limits may seldom be clearly indicated, and they may vary markedly from industry to industry, but they are still real and potent. We laugh out of court the irate defender of the status quo ante bellum in industry who insists that the chief factor in the present increased cost of living has been the extension of trade unionism, with the consequent reduction of the working-hours of Labor. But we should no less insistently laugh out of court the optimistic Socialist who would deny that the reduction of working-hours has constituted one of the factors in the high cost of living. It is not a question of defending that reduction of hours as helpful to the well-being of the community, or of arraigning it as harmful. It is a question of finding other fathers to our thoughts than wishes, and of admitting that only in exceptional industries today would a radical reduction of hours at once provide increased production absolutely so well as relatively; or even fail to cause for a time definite decline in absolute (though not in relative) production.

Such exceptional industries for the greater part would fall into two categories. The first would comprise those in which the work is so delicate that the slightest deviation from the norm, such as that caused by the worker's involuntary relax-

ation of his attention, renders the product useless. In this category would be included munitions manufacture and similar undertakings, relatively few in number. Indeed, so few are such undertakings, and so small are their products in comparison with the total output of an industrial nation like the United States, that a Socialist state would probably be little aided by the fact that a reduction of hours would not cause decreased production in such industries.

In the second category would fall such industries as work their employees at so terrific a speed, or still for so abnormally long hours, that the end of the work-day finds them subject, not merely to normal fatigue, but to abnormally intense fatigue. For although the elimination of normal fatigue by reduction of hours can usually be relied upon to effect an increase in output relatively, the fatigue of the worker must be abnormally intense before its elimination will provide an increase in his output absolutely so well as relatively. And with all due agreement with those who excoriate the effect of our present-day productive processes upon the minds and bodies of those engaged in them, it must be admitted that most of our industries today hardly fall within this category. Large stretches of the iron and steel industry, and probably most of the manufacturing industries of the South, yes; but although the eight-hour day may not yet have become the rule

in the United States, yet on the whole the twelve-hour day has also become the exception.

For instance, the report of the Commissioner of Labor of the state of Michigan for the year 1918 gives the average number of work-hours in the factories and workshops of that state for that year, as found by some 15,600 inspections, as 53.7 per week for men in offices and 54.2 per week for men in all other factory and workshop labor. The average hours worked weekly by women was 49.8. (Michigan limits by law the number of hours worked by women to 54 per week and 10 per day.) In the city of Detroit, where it is true that working conditions would probably be found less onerous than in most other large cities of the country, more than 3,000 inspections showed 49.1 hours per week as the average for men office-workers, 53.2 hours per week for all other male employees in factories and workshops, and 48.9 for the women workers. And, on the whole, the daily hours of labor in most localities probably tended slightly to decrease in 1919 in comparison with 1918.

Now, although any generalizations on the relation between length of work-day and quantity of workers' output in industry largely remain mere opinion, yet it will probably be agreed that it is the twelve-hour day from which reductions would effect increased output absolutely; and that reductions from the eight-hour day, although ef-

fecting an increased output per hour, would cause a decreased total output. So that even the most optimistic Socialist must be prepared to discover that if in industry as a whole the Cooperative Commonwealth reduces daily hours from twelve to ten, the output may improve in absolute quantity; that from ten to eight, there is at least the possibility that it will decline in absolute quantity; and that if the Cooperative Commonwealth fulfills its promise of affording its workers less than eight hours of work per day, there is a strong probability that the total amount of output will decrease. And that decrease would persist until such time as the long-range efficiency of shorter hours upon the total lifetime serviceability of the worker could make its force felt. A Socialist administration would probably be entitled to felicitations if it discovered that in most industries a 20% reduction in hours below eight per day for the first years resulted in only a 10% reduction in total output.

In the case of the farmer, the reduction of output due to shortening of hours might even be found more than temporary. Many of the circumstances now lowering the potential lifetime output of the worker in industry do not operate upon the agriculturist. Furthermore, the inevitable isolation of the farmer renders him, even in a Socialist state, less susceptible to such general communal factors in raising his total pro-

ductivity as longer schooling and better health facilities. At least in the immediate future, there seems to be every indication that agriculture will continue to be pursued largely as an individual task, and will not follow the path of highly concentrated and specialized industrial development. Under such circumstances, the farmer will produce less if he works less. But the farmer's work-day must be materially shortened in a Socialist state. Even if he did not insist, or did not effectively insist, on sharing in the general shortening of the work-day resulting from the advent of Socialism, no Socialist Government could deem itself sincerely solicitous for the entire community's well-being if it did not voluntarily provide for a generous lightening of the load of the present sunrise-to-sunset work-day of the agricultural population.

Otherwise, this loss in productivity, as previously indicated, might in all fairness not be expected to last beyond a generation. Or, at least, in all fairness it might be expected to begin to disappear after a generation. But for a temporary period, a Socialist state would have to reckon with it. For by the essence of Socialism any Socialist administration is in duty bound, and almost immediately upon arriving in power, to reduce working-hours below those now in force over the broad, general field of industry. Only let such Socialist administration effect such reduction with its eyes

open. Let it appreciate that for a period the resulting decrease in the output of essentials will have to be met, and can be met only by utilizing more workmen in the production of them.

Such an increase in the labor force should be available for diversion into the essential and quasi-essential industries as a result of the elimination of most of the socially-wasteful activities and enterprises of the capitalist system. Immediately available should be most of the Labor now engaged in the parasitic enterprises which would be discontinued almost at the outset of a Socialist administration. Connected with this new source of supply of workers would be that released by the discontinuance of the purely competitive and parasitic aspects of enterprises otherwise not to be classed as competitive and parasitic. And so interwoven and ramified is all our industry in the twentieth century that such economy of labor in certain fields has the effect of ensuring economy of labor in almost all fields. For instance, the elimination of our competitive advertising will eliminate a part of the labor used in setting type for advertisements, in plating the type, in making the paper on which such advertisements are printed, in cutting the wood from the pulp of which such paper is manufactured, in painting the sign-boards used to display such advertisements, in manufacturing the paint for such sign-boards and so forth. Moreover, there should be the

saving in labor-supply due to the sharp decrease in the number of strikes and lockouts. Also, there will be the seepage of the leisure class into the ranks of the workers; for perhaps the least disputable act of a Socialist state would be a fairly rigid application of the "no work, no eat" principle and, Soviet or no Soviet, a quite rigid application of the "no work, no vote" principle.

As a feature of this last consummation will be included the transfer into active industry of a large number of middle-class and upper-class women from their light, and more or less socially dispensable, efforts in the household. True, this problem will be shot through and through with many factors rendering legislation on the subject open to great antagonism, difficult of realization, and still more difficult of enforcement. But it is inconceivable that public opinion under Socialism should tolerate to the extent that public opinion now tolerates the economic dependence of woman on man through the mere fact of marriage, as it has now in many cases reached the point of refusing to tolerate the economic dependence of man on woman merely through that fact. Even where the married woman performs a modicum of necessary labor in the household, public opinion will become less tolerant than at present of a woman's expenditure of some fifty dollars a week as her share of the family's expen-

diture while she renders service obtainable from others for some ten or fifteen dollars a week.

Moreover, the general impetus toward standardization, centralization and voluntary cooperation inherent merely in the predominance of the Socialist philosophy will tend to professionalize and at the same time to lighten the burdens, and thus the hours, of household service. This source of increase in the volume of the available labor force will naturally be checked by the presence of small children in marriage, but such check might prove inconsiderable. In the first place, the increase of economic well-being guaranteed by Socialism will tend to make child-bearing occur earlier in marriage, and thus will free women from the care of small children earlier than at present. And in the second place, one of the prime duties and most far-reaching services of a Socialist state would be the extension of education, by means of pre-kindergarten classes and community crèches—public or privately cooperative—to the years preceding those at which the child now leaves the mother's care for the public kindergarten or the first grade of the public elementary school.

However, it is at least possible that this new supply of labor available for the production of essentials and quasi-essentials would not be sufficient to make up the loss in their total volume due to a considerable shortening of the work-day. This possibility holds particularly in view of the

inevitable delay in fitting men trained to one kind of business to function efficiently in another kind. Under such circumstances, an additional supply of workers for the more essential industries may have to be provided at the expense of other fields of endeavor. Those other fields of endeavor would probably be two in number. The first would be the production of the goods which are less essential, but which are hardly to be classed as luxuries. The second would be the socially remunerative but financially unremunerative Rural Free Delivery or Free Libraries type of Government activity planned on so extensive a scale by most Socialists.

Logically, there would be little question as to which of these two fields could best be penalized, even temporarily, for the sake of the protection of essentials. Society would thrive better by cutting down its supply of non-essentials and continuing in operation its social welfare endeavors, if reason were to be followed. But man is far from being a reasoning animal. Even in a Socialist state he is apt to prefer non-essentials which he enjoys to welfare efforts which may be more beneficial to him, but which do not furnish him positive and direct enjoyment. He is apt, more than apt, to abandon a system which denies him mere pleasures in favor of essentials for one which furnishes him mere pleasures at the expense of essentials. Man wants his tobacco and woman wants her

candy—although in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred twenty-one it might be more exact to say that both men and women want their tobacco and their candy. There can be no guarantee that they will not prefer their tobacco and candy to more frequent trains and to cheaper books, if choose they must. There can even be little confidence that they may not prove so illogical as to prefer an eight-hour work-day with tobacco and candy to a seven-hour work-day without tobacco and candy.

True, a dictatorship of the proletariat might deny them the right to choose, imposing the logical choice on them; for, at least in Russia, the dictatorship of the proletariat seems to imply the dictatorship of that portion of the proletariat which understands what is good for the entire proletariat. But there is now at hand little evidence to indicate that Socialism is destined to arrive, at least in Anglo-Saxon countries, by the Russian path. Accordingly, a Socialist state of the nature herein under consideration could remain in power only by satisfying, as well as benefiting, the great majority of the community. And the Socialist state therefore would do well, especially in its earliest period of administration, to swell the ranks of Labor in the essential industries as little as possible at the expense of the industries producing goods which render enjoyment, if not great service, to the man in the street—even

though thereby the prosecution of some of the new social welfare activities would have to be curtailed or postponed.

As it is, much, if not most, of the procedure absolutely essential to the efficient administration of the Cooperative Commonwealth will run counter to some of the most trenchant prejudices of the man in the street. Those are the prejudices against interference by the state in the daily routine of the individual life. They exist even where such interference manifestly functions for the material and spiritual benefit of the individual. Dispute as to whether such prejudices are helpful or detrimental to the organization of the Great Society is beyond the point here, although he would be indeed a staunch defender of the older paternalistic Socialism who would not find in their existence a sanguine promise of the richer blossoming of the independent human spirit. The point is, they exist. To an extent, they exist innately; to a great extent, they have been assiduously cultivated by what continues to be, in spite of some legislative attacks upon it, our political and economic laissez-faire ideology.

Under great emotional stress, the man in the street may be persuaded to acquiesce without much grumbling at the curtailment of the pleasures to which he has accustomed himself. He so acquiesced, on the whole, during the World War.

He may so acquiesce in the general burst of fervor which doubtless will environ the advent of a Socialist administration. Certainly, he would so acquiesce if he were a true proletarian, denied most of the essentials of existence, which would fall to his lot when the state seriously curtailed the production of non-essentials. But in the Marxian denotation and connotation of the word, the proletarians in the United States distinctly do not comprise the bulk of the population. What there is of our proletariat is composed very largely of our foreign-born, and in the United States the foreign-born wield less influence than even that to which their numerical strength entitles them. Our naturalization procedure serves to disenfranchise some of them; a large proportion of the remainder are swayed by religious affiliations to a somewhat greater degree than are the native-born; and all of them are subjected to the antagonism of the consciousness-not-of-our-kind which seems to have permeated America so deeply of late, and which hinders the legitimate exercise of political, social and economic power by the foreign-born, particularly when they attempt to exercise that power through the Socialist movement.

The conclusion, then, seems to be clearly indicated. The Socialist movement would do well to moderate its ultimate program and its campaign promises to the electorate regarding the reduction of the work-hours to be anticipated at the

outset of a Socialist administration. The Socialist movement will serve itself better by postponing its fruition for a few years through such moderation than by proving unable completely to fulfil promises on which it might probably ride more quickly to power. Of course, an attempt might be made statistically to set a limit to the reduction of working-hours possible to a Socialist state, along with other economic limits upon the realization of the Socialist economic program. Such an interesting attempt has been recently made by Professor Boucke. But into such a study there enter so many factors difficult to evaluate that there can be no assurance that it would prove more reliable than the attempts of economists before August 1, 1914, to chart the amount of wealth which Europe would find it possible to expend upon an international war without becoming bankrupt. A conservative Socialist writer may hence be forgiven if he hazards a mere guess that for the first years of a Socialist administration it may well prove impracticable to fix less than seven hours of work per day as the norm; and that the chances favor the possibility of fixing them at six per day little more than they favor the necessity of fixing them at eight.

In passing, it should not be forgotten that this situation should be but temporary. The necessity for this limitation on the production of the non-essentials, but more particularly on the function-

ing of the Rural Free Delivery and social welfare type of state activity under Socialism, should not be long-lived. After a generation, a new surplusage of Labor should make itself available. For after a generation, the average worker's productivity should be enormously increased over that of today by freeing him from abnormal fatigue, over-long hours, too early entrance into industry, lack of vacations necessary for bodily and mental recuperation, inadequate medical treatment, bad housing, ill-nourishing food, scanty and unscientific training for task. After a generation, the Socialist state accordingly should be in a position to shorten working-hours more radically than at its inception, to promote a greater number of wide-spread welfare activities, and to extend to a much greater scale the serviceable but financially unprofitable features of its industries. It should be then that the full richness of the promise of the Socialist ideal might begin to approximate fulfilment.

Incidentally, the temporary delay in its complete fulfilment which has thus seemed to be inevitable may well prevent the mass of the people during that delay from appreciating all the potential benefits of Socialism. Wisely or foolishly, most persons would probably expect a radical improvement in their lot without delay. The electorate in the United States has proved itself notoriously callous to pleas to await the blessings of the

future, and unwilling to grant to an innovation a reasonable length of time in which to justify itself. Joined to the other factors, material and immaterial, sordid and sincere, which will be operative to overthrow the Socialist state almost as soon as it should be born, this factor may well prove serious. At all events, it probably furnishes a most cogent, and not infrequently heard, argument for those Socialists who maintain that Socialism cannot be achieved and stabilized, even in Anglo-Saxon countries, without a temporary benevolent despotism in the guise of a dictatorship.

Discussion as to the supply of natural and material resources available for the productivity of a Socialist state would closely parallel the preceding discussion on hours of labor. Here again the Cooperative Commonwealth will discover that beyond a certain limit it cannot eat its cake and have it, too. Even the Cooperative Commonwealth cannot produce a greater amount of essential goods without utilizing a greater amount of raw materials. And with the recent squandering of our natural resources, the Commonwealth cannot utilize a greater amount of raw materials in one field without decreasing the amount available for other fields.

Postponement in the full and completely efficient use of society's natural and material re-

sources at a Socialist state's advent may thus be demanded no less sternly than postponement in the full and completely efficient use of society's labor-power. For in recent decades the world has paid less heed to the replacement of its natural resources than even the wasteful nature of capitalist production warranted. It has rendered its shortage of material resources far more crippling than it need have been rendered; and especially spendthrift of nature's wealth were the four and one-half years of international warfare. A Socialist state, therefore, in order to function productively in accord with the true principles of social collectivism, would have to clamp down on some of its possible immediate use of materials in production so as to provide nature as long a breathing-space as possible in which to recuperate and to replenish our stock of raw materials.

Indeed, indications are many that much of our present scarcity of raw materials and of other material resources will continue to weigh heavily upon production for some years to come. If it does, the predicament of a Socialist movement which may have jumped into the saddle during that period will be a sore one. It will be expected to increase production, to increase it considerably and to increase it immediately. But to meet that expectation, it will be faced by the necessity of increasing production only through continuing to utilize material resources which for the sake

of increased productivity in the future should be at once conserved. If a Socialist administration should yield to that temptation, its day of reckoning might be postponed, but would hang over it as menacingly as the sword of Damocles. Sooner or later the sword would fall, and with it would fall the Socialist hopes. Nothing may succeed like success, but nothing fails like failure. On the other hand, if a Socialist administration should not yield to that temptation, it may grievously disappoint the hopes which have been rested in it. If those hopes have been artificially stimulated beyond warrant, again indications are that the Socialist administration will fall. Every Socialist who would think his problem through would therefore do well to recognize that again caution in picturing the blessings of Socialism is demanded. And he would similarly do well to recognize that it is by no means beyond the realm of probability that a Socialist state will finally achieve stability only after having been tried and at least once found wanting.

Finally, mention of sufficient supply of goods involves some mention of wages. Discussion of the relation between wages and cost of commodities also would probably follow the same general lines as discussion of the relation between hours of labor and quantity of output. For, without the presence of other counteracting factors, and unless previous wages have been abnormally low—

far lower than, on the whole, they are, even in purchasing power, in the United States today—wages cannot be considerably raised without raising the cost of commodities. It would be as patently illogical to maintain that the wage-increases of the past five years have not constituted one of the causes of the price-increases of that period as to maintain that they have constituted the sole cause. True, the effect of higher wages, as of lower hours, should be ultimately to raise the level of the workers' productivity; but as in the case of the labor-force available to the community, that consummation may have to wait a generation for its large realization. Without the presence of counteracting factors, the Co-operative Commonwealth will discover, in the problem of wages as in the problem of hours and material resources, a limit beyond which it cannot eat its cake and have it, too.

But in the matter of wage-increases, such a counteracting factor will be present. It will be the elimination of the almost incredibly high boosts given to the retail selling-prices of commodities today by the capitalist system's method of transferring them from the first producer to the ultimate consumer. It may seriously be doubted if the profit realized by the actual producer, even where it is indefensibly high, plays a leading rôle in the final cost of most commodities. At least, in most production the percentage of

the actual selling-price chargeable against profits, even including interest on private capital and rental of land, ranks far below the percentage of selling-price chargeable against labor and the cost of raw materials. It is when commodities have once left the hands of their primary producers that in most cases the orgy of profit-taking gets well under way. Investigations and findings of our Federal Trade Commission have familiarized the public with the outrageous percentage of profits recently realized by the retailer in the marketing of shoes, for example. But there are many indications that the retail merchants of most other commodities realize a profit percentage almost as large as, or at least one-half, that of the shoe dealers. There is also much evidence that even in pre-war days there was an unjustifiably high percentage of profit normally realized by our retailers and loaded on to the purchaser in the shape of heightened prices.

In addition to the increase of prices from this source, there is that due to the profits realized by the various types of middlemen and jobbers, insofar as their efforts are dispensable without substantial injury to the processes of marketing goods efficiently. Even where their efforts are hardly thus dispensable without substantial loss of efficiency they often may be replaced in a Socialist system by distributing departments of the state producing industries, operating at cost instead of

at profit. And there are other promising and promised economies possible to the distribution of goods when it is handled by the state. Among them is the elimination of much rental by the utilization of public buildings vacant for certain portions of the day or at certain times of the year, such as armories, schoolhouses and courthouses. Similarly, there is available for use in state distribution of goods from the producer to the consumer much state-owned land, not only parks, but also streets that may without loss be closed to traffic for certain periods of the day, and military camps, forts and reservations. The consequent savings from all these sources should result in a much closer approximation of the final selling-cost to the original production-cost of most commodities than now obtains. Without attempting to chart these factors statistically, it may safely be claimed that there is at least healthy promise that these tendencies to lower the general price-level of commodities in a Socialist state may counterbalance the tendency to raise the price-level inherent in a wide-spread and substantial increase of wages. Or, to put the statement in other words, the wage-increases which must be fulfilled by a Socialist administration soon after its accession to power may result without raising the previous money-rate of wages, but by lowering the cost of commodities to the wage-earner, and thus raising the actual purchasing power of his wages.

However, lest it be feared that the contemplated increase of production under Socialism may prove to be theoretically demonstrable rather than actually realizable, let us postulate that the factors tending to increase Socialist production will be balanced by factors tending to decrease it, so that the amount of production and hence the total national income will remain the same under Socialism as under capitalism. For the year 1918, Professor B. M. Anderson, Jr., economist of the Chase National Bank, has estimated the total national income of the United States to be \$73,400,000,000. Professor Friday's estimate is \$72,000,000,000. Another estimate of our national income for 1918 now being carefully made tentatively places it at at least \$70,000,000,000. By sheer division, that amount would afford to each individual American, adult or child, an annual income of about \$700 annually; and thus to each mythical average family of man, wife and three children an annual income of \$3500 in 1918. Remembering that about one-half of the people of the United States live in rural districts, where the cost of living is appreciably lower than in the non-rural districts, that sum is equivalent to \$3000 annually for rural families and \$4000 annually for urban families in 1918.

But even the strongest Socialist critic of the present inequitable distribution of wealth under capitalism does not anticipate that a Socialist

state would be able to distribute the national income almost equitably. It is generally agreed in most Socialist circles that the different grades of wages in return for different grades of work under Socialism may have to vary considerably. In this connection, it must be remembered that the elimination of our higher incomes would entail the elimination of our present most prolific source of payment of income taxes. The tax rate imposed on the lower incomes would then have to be materially raised. It might be objected that by the time of the advent of a Socialist state the tax burden of the country, at present due largely to our participation in the World War, would be greatly lightened. But on the other hand it would be greatly increased by the cost of the various new social welfare and Rural Free Delivery type of Government enterprises, some of which a Socialist administration, no matter how conservative, would be compelled to undertake. Moreover, all of the national income cannot be used for consumption. A share of it must be saved in order to provide for increased capital equipment.

However, even allowing for considerable reductions from the \$3000 annual income for rural families and \$4000 annual income for urban families, it yet seems possible to guarantee a minimum family income sufficient to maintain a wholesome, socially-useful and even happiness-producing standard of living. The purport of these figures

for a working-class family will perhaps best be appreciated by comparing them with union scales of wages. In 1918, according to the reports of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the average union scale for bricklayers in the thirty-nine most important industrial centers in the United States was \$.80 an hour for a forty-four hour week. For employment without a day off and without overtime, this is at the rate of \$1830 annually. And union bricklayers are among the highest-paid of even the skilled workers.

As for 1920, the annual income of a union bricklayer working without one day's vacation or one hour's overtime, according to the minimum union scale of May 15, 1920, was about \$2600. But the value of the dollar in June, 1918, was from 30 per cent to 40 per cent higher than in June, 1920. Hence \$3000 annual income and \$4000 annual income in 1918 would have equaled in purchasing power incomes of from \$3900 to \$5600 annually in 1920.

The value of the dollar being about 12 per cent higher in June, 1918, than in June, 1919, \$4000 annually would have been equivalent to about \$4500 in June, 1919. And the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics has estimated that the annual budget necessary to maintain a family of five in Washington, D. C., "at a level of health and decency," at the market prices prevailing in August, 1919, was \$2260 annually. Thus it appears

that if through conservatism both in promising and in accomplishing reduction of hours and wages, a Socialist administration should keep production in its first years at the same volume as previously, there should be possible a noteworthy improvement in the material fortunes of the great bulk of the populace. That even if production should slightly decrease, general material well-being could still be assured. And that if sooner or later the Socialist mode of production should increase to any marked extent the total national wealth and the total national income, the possibilities of improved material well-being and facilities for leisure for the bulk of the people seem well-nigh limitless.

CHAPTER III.

SOCIALISM AND GUILD SOCIALISM.

THE weightiest of the factors playing upon efficiency of production, however, has yet to be considered. That is the attitude of the worker to his work. It is not the staunch Socialist, but the staunch capitalist, who admits, or rather charges, that Labor renders more valuable service in six hours of work performed with a lusty willingness than in eight hours performed reluctantly and surlily. The good-will of the workers affects not only the kind and the extent of the output. It affects also the presence or the absence of economies about the workshop or the store, the strict abolition of waste, the willingness to consider suggestions for improved methods and the invention of new devices. And it is by no means the least serious of the indictments levelled by Socialism against capitalism that under the capitalist system this good-will of the workers can seldom operate in industry. So long as the workers' rôle is merely that of selling their labor to the owners and managers of industry, so long will they withhold enthusiasm and willingness from that labor. The defenders of the capitalist system are prone to

insist that untrammelled initiative, attention to details and hostility to administrative inefficiency are not poured forth by the individual business man when he no longer "works for himself" under the inducement of profits. They must then admit that neither will these qualities be poured forth by the workers when the workers, in spite of their strategic importance in the process of production, still occupy a subordinate position in the control of industry.

It is more than a matter of sharing in the general well-being of the industry, more than a matter of better wages for better work. Of this, the failure of elaborate systems of profit-sharing and welfare work to eradicate the economic class-sullenness of the workers is all the evidence and proof necessary. Even a grudging share in the minor management of individual business units has failed to stir the whole-hearted enthusiasm of Labor for its job. Some of the more advanced trade unions in the United States, such as the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, arrived during the War at a position where in practise they shared in the minor management of industry, but it was still only minor management, and the *joie de travailler* could not thus be promulgated among them. For the answer, one must, of course, turn to human nature and to the newer psychology's analysis of human nature. For good or ill, man is so constituted that he works most unwillingly

when he is working, not for himself, but for another. Only when Labor can feel that it is not working for Capital, but is its own owner and its own director of its own destiny in its own industry, only then will Labor render the best service of which it is capable.

True, another of the factors playing upon this problem must be heeded in this connection. Human nature is a complex and tangled skein of motives, and man possesses an instinct of workmanship no less than an instinct of independence. He takes joy in viewing the product of his hands and head, and in pronouncing it good; and under those circumstances he will often perform the best work of which he is capable, even under an alien master and for an alien owner. In many of our highly skilled trades, where specialization cannot well be operative to so high a degree as in industry as a whole, such as fine jewelry and lithographing, the worker often renders his best service through the sheer joy of craftsmanship.

But such trades are the exception, rather than the rule. Moreover, they are constantly growing scarcer. Not only is industry for the greater part becoming increasingly specialized, but also handicraft work is yielding more and more to the inroads of new machinery. Retracing the steps we have taken on the road to specialization and machine industry seems to be impossible, at least for the immediate future. The inevitable

result of such retrogression would be a sharp decline in the amount of output, and such a decline would be fatal to social progress, with society's present needs in the way of material production. Perhaps after several generations of Socialism, production may become so proficient and so prolific that a return to a large measure of handicraft work would be possible. Several generations of Socialism may so cheapen the cost of production, so magnify the quantity of output, and so lower the daily hours of labor that society can afford to absorb a more expensive mode of production, a less plentiful output and an augmented work-day in return for the thrill which will possess its workers in a fuller satisfaction of their instinct of workmanship. But in view of the preceding discussion on the problems of production confronting a Socialist state, profound scepticism as to the early practicability of such a program may not seem unwarranted.

Indeed, if the United States has been accurately informed of the later development of the guild socialist movement in England, guild socialism has abandoned much of the emphasis it originally had laid upon a return to the productive processes of the William Morris craftsmen, the eighteenth century domestic workers and the medieval guild master, workmen and apprentices. By the exigencies of modern industry, most national guildsmen seem to have been compelled, reluctantly, but

inexorably, to admit that the days when individual workmen fashioned most, if not all, of their product themselves are for the present irrevocable. They now seem to put their appeal chiefly on a group, rather than on an individual, basis. Most national guildsmen now are understood to maintain that only through the guild socialistic organization of the state will Labor as a class, not the individual laborer except as a member of this class, develop the spirit of good-will and enthusiasm for its task which spells not only the maximum happiness of Labor, but also the maximum efficiency of production as an entirety.

For guild socialism indicts Socialism no less than capitalism. To the national guildsman, the Socialist remedy for capitalism's failure to enlist the full interest of the worker in his job also spells failure. The Socialist remedy, of course, especially before the World War, was the Government operation as well as ownership of important industry. The Government would be the workers, so that Government ownership and operation of industry would be workers' ownership and operation of industry. But, as the guildsman pertinently suggests, it is by no means axiomatic that, even under Socialism, the Government will be the workers. At least, it is not axiomatic that the Government will be the workers to such an extent, and in so readily transferable a technique of administration, that a So-

cialist Government will ipso facto constitute workers' control and ownership of industry. If Socialism had remained Marxism, doubtless the guild socialist indictment would have lost much of its pertinence. For the Marxian analyses called for a revolution with proletariat pitted against bourgeoisie. Although eventually all would be proletarians, yet an interval would ensue in which bourgeois would persist before becoming completely proletarianized, and in which they would necessarily have to be suppressed. The class alignment would thus also persist for a period, and the Socialistic Government might thus be trusted to function as a purely proletarian Government.

But since revisionist Socialism is predominant over Marxism in Anglo-Saxon lands, plans for evolution are predominant over plans for revolution; and a Socialist Government cannot function as a class Government so rigidly as to assure the workers in Government industry that they will become overnight the masters of their own industrial destiny. The guildsman points to state capitalism, or state socialism, during the War as evidence that the state as owner and manager may prove little improvement, if, indeed, not a deterioration, upon the individual capitalist or the capitalist corporation as owner and manager. Accordingly, his solution of a dual state, organized both for consumption and for production, presents many allure-

ments. Under guild socialism, the worker as an individual, that is, as a consumer, would owe allegiance to political bodies organized for consumption. In distribution, as in police power, coinage and foreign relations, the political bodies would reign supreme. But the worker as a worker, that is, as a producer, would owe allegiance to the guild or union in that particular industry which claimed him. In that industry, the guild would reign supreme, and the central congress of guilds would reign supreme in industry as a whole. The worker in each industry would thus be subject to the control of only his fellow-workers in that industry, instead of to the control of a central political state presumably representing the entire citizenry. Labor as Labor would thus be independent of outside control, and would conceivably bring to its task a good-will and enthusiasm not obtainable when it would be working for the political state, of which it might be only a minor, vaguely-defined and comparatively uninfluential element. (It should be added that the most recent authoritative guild socialist thought tends more and more to limit this sovereignty of the guilds, even in industry, in favor of community control; and that one of the most prominent spokesmen of the national guilds idea looks forward to the death, through atrophy, of the political state as at present organized. Indeed, it is difficult to appraise the guild idea un-

derstandingly because of differences of opinion among its exponents on vital issues; frequent change in position; and confessed lack of definiteness on many points concerning the organization of a guild socialist state.)

Extended analysis of the guild idea as applied to conditions in the United States would doubtless be superfluous, if not impertinent. For not only has guild socialism, in its present form, been evolved primarily in Great Britain to meet British conditions—it also will probably receive its first application, if it receives any application, in Great Britain long before an application in the United States will be possible. For, industrially, Labor is far more extensively and effectively organized in Great Britain than in the United States, and politically it is ably organized in the British Labor Party. While in the United States the American Federation of Labor is a non-political body; the Farmer-Labor Party is still an embryo; the Non-Partisan League is more of an agrarian than a Labor movement; and the Socialist Party of America is infinitely further removed from the seat of power than the British Labor Party. Furthermore, British Labor is far better mentally equipped than American. It has developed greater administrative skill, both in trade union activities and in general Governmental endeavor. Again, British political thought and practise have not sanctioned the dominance

of the entire political state over the rights of individuals and the rights of subsidiary groups to the same pervasive extent as have American thought and practise. Above all, guild socialism should be at present more applicable to industry than to agriculture, especially since industrial Labor is everywhere far more thoroughly organized than agricultural Labor; and Great Britain is more of an industrial nation than the United States, where almost 40% of the population is still rural and where tenant farming, the rule in England, is still, despite its recent rapid growth, the exception. (The 1920 census showed only 52% of the population of the United States living in incorporated cities or towns of 2,500 inhabitants or more, 9% living in incorporated places of less than 2,500 inhabitants, and 39% living in what the Census Bureau calls rural districts.) Guild socialism might succeed in Great Britain and later fail in the United States; if it should fail in Great Britain, its failure in the United States could be predicted with almost absolute confidence.

Nevertheless, at this point some criticism of the guild socialist idea may not prove irrelevant in considering the general problem of the efficiency of the Socialist program in stimulating production. In the first place, it is obvious that much support given the guildsman's indictment of the treatment of Labor in Government industry arose from dissatisfaction at war conditions. Those war condi-

tions presented to the Government the opportunity to impose, or possibly the necessity of imposing, many restrictions upon its Labor which would be unavailable in peace-time. Even if the political state were normally as vicious an employer and manager as the national guildsman maintains, nevertheless only in war-times could it forbid its workers to leave one form of employment in order to enter another, or one factory in the same trade for another, for instance. In time of peace, the political state as employer could not enforce arbitrary decrees upon its workers by threatening them with the trenches as the alternative to implicit obedience. Public opinion would not tolerate arbitrary handling of the workers in peace as it tolerated arbitrary handling of them in war; and the workers, by their organization as workers, would be more prone and better able to resist such arbitrariness than they were prone and able from 1914 to 1919.

In the second place, the political state as employer and as manager during the War was still a political state with leaders who were imbued with the capitalist point of view and who followed the capitalist philosophy as their guiding-star. In other words, the great majority of the population had not yet been educated or had not yet educated itself out of the capitalist ideology into the socialist. But before a Socialist state can be established, at least by the politically democratic pro-

cesses which Anglo-Saxon countries seem to impose upon their Socialist movements, the great majority of the population, including the overwhelming majority of the workers, will have to be converted to the Socialist program. Thus not only will the leaders of the Socialist state be necessarily permeated with the Socialist point of view, as contrasted with leaders of the capitalist state who still grudge to Labor the concessions they are compelled to grant it, and who concentrate upon the problem of the welfare of the workers not one more moment of attention than they are compelled to concentrate. But also the leaders of the Socialist state will have back of their administration a public opinion which will not tolerate the moral and material exploitation of the workers characteristic of the British Government, supported by capitalist public opinion, as employer and manager during the War. Even the peace-time activities of the state which might be termed state socialism are activities pursued by a capitalist, not by a Socialist, state. A few forms of Socialism within the capitalist system are in no sense fairly representative of Socialism as a whole, and indictments of Socialism drawn only from those forms are inadequate indictments.

Similarly, resentment against whatever degree of bureaucracy adheres to state ownership and management of industry may well be lessened as the worker's hours of labor are lessened.

Procedure which appears intolerable in a nine-hour work-day may be viewed much more tolerantly in a seven-hour work-day. Much of the worker's resentment is generated in the last two hours of his day's work, and may well disappear when those two hours are released from the necessity of laboring, and are devoted to leisure or recreation which will tend to banish the remembrance of his job—if one admit that even under guild socialism much work must still be irksome or most work must still be irksome to a degree.

In the third place, the present organization of the workers as workers will carry over into the Socialist state. Indeed, it may safely be assumed that if most of the workers should become sufficiently imbued with the political doctrines of Socialism to vote the Socialist ticket, they will have become sufficiently indoctrinated with the principles of trade unionism to increase the number, the size and the strength of their unions. There is nothing in the Socialist conception and program to inhibit trade unions under Socialism—indeed, many of the most far-visioned Socialists welcome the activities of trade unions under Socialism, even though the unions may conceivably on occasion find it necessary to oppose the political Socialist state. So far from trying to forbid strikes, by injunction or by other methods, a wise Socialist state would assume that the threat of a strike could be taken as demanding an inquiry

into possibly unjust conditions, and that the presence of unions would be a wholesome corrective against state exploitation of Labor. Against the Socialist state as employer, the strike would become a more potent weapon than even against a private employer under the capitalist system; and it is thus difficult to appreciate why many of the evils of state control of industry of which the national guildsman complains could not be remedied by the industrial action of the workers against the political state, without going so far as to limit the supremacy of the state in the entire structure of society.

In the fourth place, much of the autocracy now charged against the political state as owner and manager is due, not to the inherent nature of the political state, but to its present geographical organization. At present, the delegate chosen from each of the state's geographical subdivisions is expected to represent all the constituents of that division, whatever the economic classes to which they belong. If the constituency be composed of many economic classes, as are most of our urban constituencies, in practise the delegate is usually found to represent the most powerfully-organized class in it. With still only the minority of the workers in the United States so organized as to make their political influence effective, the delegate in most cases today thus represents the economic interests of the bourgeoisie. Even in the

rural districts, except in the newly-awakened Northwest, where the economic class lines are apt to be homogeneous, the bourgeoisie, by social pressure, by control of the sources from which public opinion derives, and by the indirect rather than the direct influence of its economic position, usually manages to have the selected delegate represent the bourgeois point of view. Nothing could demonstrate the inadequacy of the geographical organization of the state more tellingly than the fact that even our rural districts in most cases choose lawyers to represent them at Washington. Not seldom has it been suggested that the Senate of the United States, even as it fills page after page of the *Congressional Record* with denunciations of Soviet Russia, in itself constitutes a lawyers' soviet.

It is unnecessary here to analyze the reasons for this supremacy of the upper and the middle class points of view in our legislative halls, however patent and demonstrable the reasons may be. It is sufficient merely to glance at our elected representatives in the legislative, executive and judicial branches of our Government in order to realize that the economic strata they represent do not square with the economic strata of the people who elect them. There is room for argument as to whether the middle economic class or the working-class is more numerous in the United States, but certainly there is no disputing that the upper class

is not the most numerous. Yet just as certainly there can be little disputing that the most numerous class in Congress is the upper class, upper class whether in economic position or in intellectual and emotional avenue of approach to the problems confronting the nation. Whatever the causes, geography as the structural basis for the political state has been found lamentably favorable to the upper classes.

One need not be a Marxian to realize that the economic alignment is a more accurate, more truly representative and more effective basis for organizing the political state than the geographical alignment. Even the most opportunist evolutionary or revisionist Socialist must recognize that the individual's economic status furnishes the key to the explanation of his conduct, even though he may not assign to economic status the well-nigh omnipotent influence that the Marxian assigns to it. Indeed, for the recognition of that fact, one need not be a Socialist at all, Marxian and revolutionary, or non-Marxian and evolutionary. The man in the street, if the problem were placed before him, not in Marxian, nor in economic, nor in political philosophic phraseology, but in the phraseology of the street, would agree that the economic line-up is the fundamental line-up. If the political state is to be truly representative of the life of the community over which it is sover-

eign, it must alter its geographic structure in favor of an occupational one.

It may then be seriously questioned if much of the fear inspired in the national guildsman at the prospect of the political state as the owner and manager of industry would not vanish if the political state should be organized along occupational lines. For instance, no class of workers is more mercilessly exploited in private industry in the United States today than the workers in our postal system, a socialistic enterprise in a capitalistic state. But even if their lot should not be lightened under a Socialistic state, and even if their exploitation should persist after they had become industrially so well organized as the railroad locomotive engineers or the anthracite miners—as well they might be—even then they might not without reason look for relief to an occupationally-chosen Government. Such a Government would be organized from a Congress or from an electoral college in which the proportion of workers' representatives would be as high as the proportion of workers in the entire population. Under a Government thus organized, there is little likelihood that even political expediency or administrative shortsightedness could subject the postal employees to the prejudices of a Southern Bourbon mind, to which, in all fairness, much of their present plight is due. Even if an occupational census should show the workers not in an

absolute majority, yet it would also show the upper-class, which at present is the majority mind of our Government, in a distinct minority. From a Government including, say, only thirty per cent workers, twenty per cent farmers and ten per cent farm tenants and agricultural laborers, the postal employees might be expected to receive fairer treatment. At all events, it may perhaps not irrelevantly be suggested to the national guildsmen that they might well give a fair trial to the sovereign political state organized occupationally before insisting on so altogether a revolutionary upset of our present political conceptions as a dual sovereignty of producer and consumer within the nation.

In the fifth place, if guild socialism is to become effective, it must become effective in all industry at practically the same time. It is difficult to conceive of a guild state functioning successfully where one section of its Labor would be yielding allegiance partly to the guild and the central guild congress, while another section would still be existing under a single allegiance, both for production and for consumption, to the political state. Now, the difficulty here arising is that of varying degrees of administrative ability among the various workers in the various trades. Let it be granted that the Amalgamated Clothing Workers could quite satisfactorily handle all the problems of the clothing in-

dustry, the coal miners the coal industry, the railroad brotherhoods the railroads. Yet the workers in other trades, in all frankness, are far from having attained the sheer intelligence required completely to administer those trades. By and large, the more intelligent workers tend to gravitate to the more highly-skilled trades. Where they might be successful in taking over the control of their trades, their less intelligent and more unskilled fellows might well be unsuccessful. To sacrifice delicacy to definiteness, can the impartial observer rest assured that our iron and steel workers can be as successfully entrusted with our steel mills as our railroad workers with our railroads?

The guildsman may object that the worker will develop with responsibility—indeed, can develop only by responsibility. But one has only to look at the decisions of our political electorate to appreciate how slowly most of us grow up to our civic responsibilities. Even the most orthodox worshipper at the shrine of political democracy must regretfully confess that many of the earlier ardent hopes reposed in the practise of political democracy have proved fictitious. Democracy may remain the most satisfactory method of attaining the political decisions of the state, but it is by no means as free from error and mischief as our forefathers were prone to imagine. It did not need the War to demonstrate that the political decisions

of the electorate in the first decade of the twentieth century seem not much wiser than those of the first decade of the nineteenth. True, it may be insisted that the act of voting on political matters is not fairly to be compared with the act of voting on industrial matters. As will be suggested later, decisions of the electorate in the political field are far less important than decisions in the industrial field. The mistakes are less serious, affect the voters less intimately, and are less clearly recognizable. The influence of the state's political activities upon the daily life and welfare of the individual voter is usually indirect and secondary; the influence of the state's industrial activities upon the voter's welfare is graphically brought home to him in almost every hour of his working day. Economic conditions are all-important, but are guided only slightly by political conditions, and four years of an inept Presidential administration are—four years of an inept Presidential administration.

But there is another distinction between democratic control of political life and democratic control of industrial life. Just because decisions in the political field are relatively insignificant, the mistakes of the electorate in those decisions are of relatively little moment. If it is from their political mistakes that the voters learn, in most cases little harm will have been wrought. But mistakes in control of industry are by no means to be taken

so lightly. Four years of an inept administration of a keynote industry are much more than merely four years of an inept administration. Political administration is a thick-skinned organism which is not easily injured, and which can usually afford to get ahead somehow by the process of muddling through; but industry today is a highly delicate and vulnerable mechanism—sharp blunders in its management may result in widespread and long-spread injuries which will engrave deep and painful scars, if not crippling mutilations, on the entire community. An unreliable electorate in industry cannot enjoy the same lengthy opportunity to become reliable through its many mistakes as can an unreliable electorate in politics.

Similarly, it might be objected that the voters' political decisions have not seemed to wax wiser with the generations because the political problems with which they have been confronted have waxed more complicated with the generations. But the retort is obvious—the problems confronting industry are likewise constantly becoming more complicated with the generations, and will increasingly require greater intelligence from an industrial electorate.

Finally, Guild Socialism may easily develop dangers direr than those which it seeks to remedy. In meeting one demand of human nature which it claims simon-pure Socialism neglects, it may it-

self be neglecting another demand of human nature no less deep-rooted than the first. In trying to mold a system of society which will meet man's instinct of independence in work, it may be molding a system which will pamper to man's instinct of selfish aggrandisement. For man can no longer be regarded as the shining sun of reason and high purpose which the purely economic philosophers were prone to depict. We have begun to study him coolly and critically, and we find him in no sense entitled to any foreordained and especially-reserved place in nature. Not only is man imperfect, but his imperfection is inextricably wrought up with the sad imperfection of this mundane universe. Not only is he a creature of crude emotions and animal instincts, as well as of mentality; but also his emotions and instincts are highly developed while his mentality is but slightly developed, and he is guided by his emotions and instincts nine times for once that he is guided by his mind. On the whole, he may still be regarded as the highest of the animals, but he is not so widely separated from the next highest as to afford him grounds for complacency. In a few respects, man is lower than some of the other animals, and on occasions he lowers himself beneath many of them—few of the species of the animal kingdom ever behave toward themselves or toward other species as man behaved toward himself during and after the World War.

Few attacks hurled against Socialism prove themselves so futile as the argument that Socialism is impossible because of the imperfection of human nature. But the argument is futile, not because the emphasis on human nature is not overwhelmingly relevant, but because it would be applied more fittingly to the present capitalist system than to a socialist system. It is the capitalist system which is failing because of man's inherent selfishness. For the weakness of capitalism is that it tempts man to yield to his selfish impulses by the lure of profit, hoping in vain that his altruism will guard him from surrender to the temptation. Capitalism is failing just because it presents too many occasions when the individual's personal gain conflicts with the gain of the entire community, too few occasions when the individual's personal advancement happens to coincide with the advancement of the entire community.

On the other hand, it is the virtue of the Socialist movement that it is built on the assumption of the essential weakness of human nature. The Socialist program is so framed as to deliver the individual from economic temptation so far as he can be delivered. The Socialist conception of the economic organization of society abolishes the system whereby man may be tempted by the lure of profits to advance at the expense of his fellow-man. It substitutes a system whereby he is rewarded in proportion to the direct benefit he con-

fers upon his fellows, the higher rewards for the higher benefits and the lower rewards for the lower benefits. It is Socialism, not capitalism, which cherishes no illusions regarding the weakness of man's altruism and the strength of man's selfishness.

But Guild Socialism would seem to lay itself seriously open to the charge of failing adequately to appreciate the need for a system of society which will hold our selfish impulses in check. Guild Socialism would diminish the danger that the individual would be tempted to exploit society, but it would keep alive the danger that the separate guild or group of guilds would be tempted to exploit it. Under Socialism proper, the individual's progress toward prosperity would lie along the road of benefiting the entire community; under Guild Socialism, the individual's progress toward prosperity would lie along the road of the aggrandisement of his particular guild. And the aggrandisement of the individual guild might well conflict with the aggrandisement of the entire community—the fewer hours the guild would work and the higher wages it would receive, the better for its members. Guild Socialism would offer to a group the same temptation to rise to affluence through injury to the entire body politic that capitalism offers to the individual business man or private corporation. Capitalism has failed because the individual man has proved

too weak a vessel to withstand that temptation; what guaranty can Guild Socialism offer that the individual guild will be able to rise superior to it? For the checks suggested by the Guild Socialists which would thwart selfish impulses of the guilds, separately or as a group, must seem all too impotent to one who regretfully insists that such impulses would be both numerous and powerful.

Consider, for example—as Graham Wallas has recently asked an American audience to consider in this connection—the teachers in our public schools. In view of the accelerated failure of present-day society to attract its more advanced types into teaching, it is easy to wax cynical at the teaching profession. It is no difficult matter to convict the teachers of unintelligence in the calling in which intelligence is the prime necessity, to depict them as almost so deeply in need of learning as those who sit at their feet. And yet, after having indulged the taste for cynicism at the expense of the teachers, it is impossible not to admit that they are at least as intelligent as the members of other callings. If it be true that most teachers have drifted into their work because no other work lay so readily accessible to them, and if it be true that most of them would adopt other work if they would prosper thereby, yet it is likewise true that most persons in other callings have also drifted into them, and would abandon them in

favor of other activities, if they could thereby prosper. Teaching, moreover, is essentially a socialistic function of a capitalist state. There is nothing of profit-making about it; and, in spite of the benefits to be derived, as in most callings, from toadying to the authorities and playing the courtier to social, religious and industrial vested interests, on the whole the teacher can best advance himself by rendering good service in his field to the same extent as the worker in other fields. The teachers can hardly be expected to reveal less altruism, any more than they can be expected to reveal less intelligence, than other workers.

But experience would indicate that the application of the guild socialist principle even in teaching would be attended by grave perils. Probably few forces have been so hostile to thoroughgoing reforms in our school-systems as have the teachers themselves. Whenever the contemplated reforms involved longer hours for them—the indictment levelled against the proposal to introduce the Gary system in the public schools of New York City, for instance—the teachers have often been found to prefer their own comfort to the welfare of the community. In those municipalities where politics and schools have become bedfellows, it has frequently been the teachers themselves who have pulled political wires in the hope of acquiring favors, even though teachers should be the very

first to recognize that the intrusion of politics into the public school system involves an irreparable injury to the children in their charge and to the entire community. If the teachers should be given complete control of education, it is therefore hard to hope that they would be able to resist the perfectly normal impulse to alter the processes of the educational system with an eye first to their own advantage, and only secondly to the full needs of the schools. Again, the checks upon that impulse provided by the suggested Cultural Councils, representing the entire community's interest in education, seem inadequate.

What holds good for teachers when organized into a completely autonomous group will surely hold good for plumbers, bricklayers, miners, lumberjacks, and machinists. If the teachers prove themselves weak sisters in the face of the temptation, the thoroughly human and perhaps not reprehensible temptation, to think first and basically of their own interests, surely we have no authority to assert that face-to-face with the same fire the plumbers, bricklayers, miners, lumberjacks and machinists will not prove themselves weak brothers. To present men with the opportunity of lowering their hours of labor and of raising their wages, even to the point of injuring society, and then to trust them to refrain lest society be injured, seems to impose upon man's moral constitution a burden which in his present state of

moral development is unwarranted and unjustified.

It may be objected, again, that these pessimistic considerations are proved unreal by the record of the workers' present association into industrial groups, or trade unions. The national guildsman may claim that the guild is but the logical extension of the union, and that the former cannot logically be rejected because of the danger of its selfish aggrandisement without rejecting also the latter. Certainly, it cannot be denied that the trade unions have been, are, and give every promise of continuing to be, a thoroughly helpful element in raising the level of existence, not only of Labor, but of the whole community. But between the trade union in a capitalistic or even in a socialistic system of society and the national guild under guild socialism there is a dissimilarity which may not be marked, but which is profound. It is not merely that the trade union of today exists largely for the negative purpose of preventing the exploitation of its members, and of wringing from the employers concessions which have become manifestly overdue. For even under Socialism the trade union fortunately seems destined to prevent the exploitation of its members by the state, and to wring from the state any concessions which may become overdue. The difference is that, even so, the trade union under Socialism will not be wholly independent, even solely in the field of production,

of the political state. The political state, voluntarily or involuntarily, will grant autonomy to the union, and will interfere as little as possible in its direct workings; but in the last analysis, and not merely during crises in the nation's development, the trade union will have to recognize the ultimate sovereignty of the state in the industrial as well as in the political field. Where the advantage to the union conflicts with advantage to the remainder of the population, the former will have to yield precedence to the latter. Doubtless, in most phases of the worker's life, his point of view will be his union point of view; but in the background of his consciousness, available for summons at necessity, will thus hover the social point of view of the welfare of the entire community.

The Plumb Plan for our railroads gives the railroad workers a certain amount of independence in their calling, and, if put into operation, would probably be progressively altered so as to give them more. But it nevertheless is based on the assumption of, and keeps constantly before the railroad employees' vision, the paramount conception of the union's welfare as subordinate to the welfare of the public at large, whenever the two happen not to coincide. Complete autonomy and the right to strike for autonomy up to the point of secession from the sovereignty of the political state must be granted labor organizations

under Socialism; but that will still fall short of the guild socialist conception, as it is understood in the United States. There is as much difference between industrial autonomy of unions and their complete independence as between political autonomy of British colonies and their complete independence from the ultimate sovereignty of the British Empire. It is obvious that the grant of complete independence to the component parts of the British Empire would involve the disintegration of the Empire, which may or may not be desirable. Similarly, it is difficult to conceive how the grant of complete independence to the component units of industrial production within the political state would not finally involve the disintegration of that state—which may or may not be desirable, but which falls beyond the scope of the present survey, necessarily based on the postulation of the undesirability of anarchism.

But, finally, the national guildsman may demur on the ground that the guilds under guild socialism would not be independent in their sovereignty. Each would be subject to the decrees of the general guild congress, which would represent all the guilds; and it would be the guild congress, not the individual guild, whose jurisdiction would be supreme in the field of production. Any tendency that a single guild might develop toward selfish aggrandisement should thus be checked by the action of the other guilds. Now, it is true that where

the self-interest of a single guild, or of a small group of guilds, should conflict with the interests of the entire body of guilds, the latter, through the general guild congress, could be counted upon to interpose a veto. But the decisions of the general guild congress could easily be dominated by a group representing the majority of workers within the guilds and yet not representing the majority of the population. As for control over the guilds by the entire community, through joint councils with the bodies representing the consumers' and civic interests—if I understand the proposal correctly, in practise it hardly guarantees that the control will be effective, and in theory it should not represent the community's interests more adequately than a central political body organized occupationally. And that involves the all-important question of method of procedure.

If any deduction from the hectic history of Anglo-Saxon countries in the past one hundred years can be hazarded for the benefit of the next one hundred years, it would be the stolid aversion of Anglo-Saxon electorates to entertain new ideas so subversive of the old as justly to be termed revolutionary. Except when hurled into the midst of actual revolutionary events, such as a war or a business panic, Anglo-Saxondom sticks by the process of gradual change in the old ideas.

By perseverance, propagandists can manage to bring England and the United States around to consider the extension or the diminution of their current forms of political government; but it is hardly an exaggeration to conclude that only by a miracle or a cataclysm can they bring these countries around, no longer to alter their old conceptions gradually in the direction of new ones, but rudely and cleanly to uproot them, and in the same gesture replace them, by an altogether novel political system. It is not now open to England and the United States to start with a clean slate, as it was open to the American colonies at the end of the eighteenth century, and as it has recently become open to Russia, and to less degree, to Germany, Poland, and the new states evolved from the collapse of Austria-Hungary. England and the United States have now a political past whose intellectual and emotional claims upon them cannot be denied or evaded. It may take a new broom to sweep clean, but Anglo-Saxondom now seems in normal times to shudder at clean sweeps.

Now, in comparison with our current political system, guild socialism is an altogether revolutionary idea. It lays violent hands upon the theory of the unified sovereignty of the political state which has now become cherished so very fervently in Anglo-Saxon bosoms as to develop into a pseudo-religious article of faith. And the great bulk of the Anglo-Saxon electorate will not

only be unwilling to grasp the implications of any new principle which runs counter to the unified sovereignty of the political state—it also may be unable to grasp them. Socialist propaganda has been conducted with rare persistence, although also with rare clumsiness, for several decades in the United States; and still it may be seriously doubted if it has penetrated the minds of the mass of Americans sufficiently to explain the Socialist idea to them. It may seriously be doubted if it is only a minority of the one hundred five million Americans who still believe that socialism is a step in the direction of anarchism rather than a step away from anarchism, or if indeed it is only a minority who still believe that socialism and anarchism are largely synonymous.

But as contrasted with the socialist conception of the state, the guild socialist conception is more difficult of comprehension and apprehension. How much more onerous and tedious, then, to make the guild socialist idea understood! How much more open than even the socialist idea it will be to misrepresentation, honest or dishonest, from the sources from which most public opinion is formulated! True, if most Americans were industrial workers, they might not find the guild socialist program so hard to comprehend; but the majority of Americans is not composed of industrial workers. Before the guild socialist idea could become dominant in the United States, it would have

to be fairly appreciated by the large agricultural class and the middle economic class who still, in many cases, seem unable to appreciate the present status of mere trade union aspirations in the modern capitalist political state. Of course, if no other road seems to be open, the rejectors of the capitalist system will have to buckle down to the frightfully difficult task of converting this non-working-class majority to the guild socialist conception. But if it be possible to arrive at, or approximately at, the guild socialist goal by the gradual transformation of capitalism into socialism, for which, after all, the ground has now been partially broken, and thence into whatever of guild socialism seems demanded by mankind's needs, the procedure will be rendered less difficult, more rapid and probably freer from pitfalls.

For Socialism, in the theory underlying its program, cannot be regarded as an altogether revolutionary alteration of the present political state. It is only the theory underlying its philosophy as commonly promulgated which demands a revolutionary change in the mental concepts now current in Anglo-Saxondom. Indeed, it is the Socialists' insistence, especially in the United States, on clothing their appeal and their program in the shell of the class struggle, and the economic interpretation of history, and the social revolution (*sic*), and the theory of surplus value, which has persuaded the great bulk of the electorate that

Socialism involves a complete upheaval of our political system. American Socialists may resent the common American belief that Socialism is incompatible with Americanism, but for that belief they have chiefly themselves to blame. They have succumbed to the emotional temptation to depict themselves as revolutionists, devoted to a revolutionary program; and the man in the street may well be pardoned for being so unversed in the niceties of radical phraseology as to jump at the conclusion that a revolution in America implied an assault on the institutions existing in America. Only a small amount of anti-Socialist propaganda was thus necessary to induce the populace to take the Socialists at their word. But many of the all-important activities of even the present capitalistic political state in America are prosecuted in accord with the theory of Socialism. And it is as difficult to see what Socialism stood to lose as it is easy to see what Socialism stood to gain if the American Socialists had explained to the American public that Socialism was more of an extension than an innovation.

Socialism in the United States would be immeasurably nearer realization if its adherents had taken the tack of paraphrasing Bernard Shaw, reminding their hearers that the anti-Socialist leaving his club near midnight steps to a socialistic sidewalk along a socialistic street bordered with socialistic trees; lights his cigar with a match

struck on a socialistic street-lamp, often deriving power from a socialistic gas or electricity plant, and lit five hours previously by a socialistic lamplighter employed by the city's socialistic department of street illumination; crosses a socialistic bridge over a socialistic river, often traversed by socialistic ferryboats; passes a socialistic school which will be manned the following morning by socialistic teachers; drops a letter into a socialistic mail-box which is a part of the socialistic postal system; as he passes through a socialistic park, cheerily greets a socialistic policeman; stops to watch a socialistic fire engine of the socialistic fire department proceeding to extinguish an unsocialistic fire; and, on arriving home, awakens his wife to repeat to her some of the arguments he had used in the discussion at the club to prove that Socialism was all right in theory, but could never be applied in practise. And such tactics would not only have brought Socialism nearer. There is no evidence, aside from mutterings anent "bourgeois reform" and "compromise," that the Socialism thus sooner achieved would be less full or less rich than the Socialism to be later achieved by more intransigent tactics.

But whether the socialist creed be paraded before the public in evolutionary or in revolutionary raiment, surely its essence can be more readily and will be more willingly grasped by the electorate

than the guild socialist creed. If, accordingly, the guildsman can attain his desideratum through the success of Socialism, followed by Socialism's liberalization toward the guild idea, he will thereby probably attain it sooner than by rejecting the socialist movement altogether, and bombarding the public with unadulterated guild socialist shot. The national guildsman may retort that the political state as owner and manager in industry is so evil, and so diametrically a step away from, rather than toward, the guild socialist state, that he cannot compromise with Socialism any more readily than he can compromise with capitalism. But the Socialist state can go—indeed, must go—great lengths toward the realization of the guild socialist program, even if it cannot go the entire distance. For, even if the confirmed Socialist insists that the national guildsman's picture of industry under Socialism is overdrawn, yet surely there can be no denial that the guild socialist colors have startlingly revealed many rough spots on the Socialist canvas. Most Socialists today would admit that their hammering at the hands of the national guildsmen has forced them to alter the Socialist program in many particulars; and that all too well-founded are the guild socialist indictment and rejection of industry proceeding under the direct and bureaucratic management of the central political state, with little more power and

responsibility reposed in the workers than now obtaining.

As a result of guild socialist and syndicalist agitation, the Socialist program has shifted far toward workers' autonomy in industry, with as little interference as possible from the political state except in general legislation. Thanks largely to guild socialism, any Socialist administration arriving at power must be prepared almost immediately to grant the workers' organizations in the various industries an almost free hand in the development of their industries. With the grant of this large measure of autonomy, there would be fair opportunity to determine the sufficiency of the Socialist program in meeting the workers' legitimate demands for freedom from undue and socially-harmful outside interference and from possible state exploitation. If then the Socialist program should be found insufficient to meet these demands, and the correctness of the guild socialist principle should be sustained, the final step from socialism to guild socialism should be taken with less of a wrench than would be involved in the step from capitalism directly to guild socialism.

If these considerations are substantially valid, it would seem that the duty devolves upon the guildsmen of refraining from weakening the Socialist movement while keeping alive their guild socialist ideal and program, trusting that the ulti-

mate administration of a Socialist state not only will be a long step and the quickest possible step toward guild socialism, but also will afford the best possible opportunity for the necessary test of the practicability of the guild program. Insistence on the guild socialist idea alone would seem like abandoning progress already made toward the center of the state from the entrance to the right, after much and long painful groping and stumbling, only to reach, after additional long and painful groping and stumbling, the same center of the same stage from the entrance to the left.

CHAPTER IV.

SOCIALISM AND THE MARXIAN CAST OF THOUGHT.

BUT the problem of Socialist procedure has deeper implications. The entire Socialist movement in the United States lies in utmost need of reconsidering, not merely the relation between it and the guild socialist movement, but the relation between it and the whole spectrum of American life. For obviously something is wrong. After some twenty years of a centrally-organized Socialist movement, following almost as many preceding years of more or less spasmodic Socialist propaganda, the Socialist Party of America has not yet polled seven per cent of the votes in a presidential election. Only on five occasions have Socialists been elected to the national House of Representatives, never more than one at a time, with only two Congressional districts thus represented and each of them composed largely of a foreign-born electorate; and no single Socialist candidate has yet come close to election to the Senate. The two large cities which have elected Socialist mayors are in neighboring states; and outside of them and New York, Chicago, Cleveland, Buffalo, there

have been no Socialist municipal aldermen or councilmen in our largest cities. In Philadelphia, with almost 2,000,000 people, in Detroit, St. Louis, Boston, Baltimore, all cities with a population of more than 700,000, and all important industrial and manufacturing centres, not one Socialist has been elected to important office on the Socialist ticket. It will not be expected that membership in the Socialist Party of America should approximate the Socialist vote, any more than that the number of members in Democratic or Republican organizations should approximate the Democratic or Republican vote; but there is room for serious thought in the fact that membership in the Socialist Party has never risen far above the 100,000 level, and that at present there are probably less than 50,000 holders of S. P. cards. It may be seriously doubted if the Communist Party and Communist Labor Party would have been able to roll up a larger combined membership than 50,000 if they had not been subjected to ruthlessly unprincipled official and unofficial persecution. And the vote, not the membership, of the Socialist Labor Party in the national election of 1916 was 14,180, in a total vote of more than 18,500,000.

Moreover, the membership of the Socialist Party of America has been recruited to an abnormally large extent from the foreign-born. Indeed, many of these foreign-born members had been partici-

pants in the Socialist movements of their respective countries of birth, and for their presence in the Socialist ranks in the United States the Socialist movement of America is but slightly responsible. The national Socialist vote, such as it is—about 6% in 1912, about $3\frac{1}{4}\%$ in 1916 and less than 4% of the total in 1920—was polled largely in the foreign-born sections of the country. (However, in all fairness it should be added that the 1916 elections were fought primarily on the issue of participation in the World War, when to cast a vote which could have no effect in re-electing or defeating President Wilson was asking too much of the practical-minded American electorate.) The two large cities which have elected Socialist mayors have been Milwaukee and Minneapolis. In 1910, 30% of the population of Milwaukee was foreign-born, and of almost 50% of the population one or both parents were foreign-born. The corresponding figures for Minneapolis were $28\frac{1}{2}\%$ and 39%. These figures must be viewed in the light of a $14\frac{1}{2}\%$ foreign-born population and a $20\frac{1}{2}\%$ of foreign or mixed parentage for the entire country in 1910. Of the delegates to the national Socialist convention in 1920, some 40% were foreign-born; since a native-born member would naturally have at least no disadvantage over a foreign-born member in the selection of the delegates by the Socialist locals, it may not be unwarranted to deduce that at least that propor-

tion of the Socialist Party membership is foreign-born. These statistics are eloquent. They cry aloud that the Socialist movement in the United States has failed, signally failed, to impress itself as firmly upon the American consciousness as the Socialist movement has impressed itself upon the consciousness of all the other great Western Powers.

The American Socialist can hardly maintain that the backwardness of the American Socialist movement, so far as popular support for it is concerned, is due to the large number of farmers in the United States. For there is Italy, although it is true that there may be in Italy proportionately less farmer ownership of the land than in the United States. Moreover, the number of farmers in the United States has been proportionately decreasing, but the Socialist vote has not been proportionately increasing. Nor can he well maintain that the Socialist achievement in this country is satisfactory in view of its youth. The achievement of national prohibition shows what can be accomplished within several decades by a movement which is well organized and which appeals warmly to the bulk of the population; and after twenty years of organization most of the European Socialist parties could boast of achievements far more considerable than those which the Socialist Party of America can produce. Even if the votes cast for the national Farmer-Labor ticket in 1920 be

counted as Socialist votes and added to the votes cast for Debs, from the information available as I write it appears that such a total Socialist vote would not exceed 5% of all the votes cast. Of such a percentage of the total popular vote in their respective countries, most European Socialist parties would be heartily ashamed. And even these few Socialist ballots were ballots largely of mere protest against Palmerism and Burlesonism, and against the failure of either the Republican or the Democratic Party to nominate a progressive or a liberal or even a well-known candidate—many of the Socialist voters in 1920 were not voting for Socialism and will probably desert the Socialist ticket in 1922 and 1924. Even allowing for the facts of the temporary unpopularity of the Socialist Party because of its anti-war attitude, the defection of the Communist elements, the enforced collapse of the Socialist organization in many states, and the nomination for President of a man serving a jail sentence for opposing the selective draft, even with these allowances it is startling to realize that in 1920 the Socialist Party did not poll as high a percentage of the total ballots cast as in 1912. And in 1912 there were three instead of two major political parties in the field, with only one of the Presidential candidates an avowed conservative and with another of unusually strong personal following, particularly in the ranks of Labor.

The American Socialist may maintain that the Socialist movement is feeble in the United States because the American working-class has not yet become a proletariat in the Marxian sense of the word. He may insist that the natural resources of the United States are so fertile that some of the prosperity of the country could not be kept from trickling down into the working-class, so that the workers, although exploited, are yet not so miserable and poor as the workers in the European countries where Socialism has become powerful. But such reasoning quite begs the question. If Socialism cannot arrive in the United States until the proletarians represent the majority of the population, until the lot of the proletariat becomes wretched, and until the proletarians become desperate; and if that period of the industrial development of the United States is not yet at hand, then, surely, there is no reason for the existence of a politically-organized Socialist movement. Until the time is ripe for Socialism in America, the convinced Socialist may well despair of converting the American people to the Socialist program; Socialist propaganda and education of the working-class will be valuable, but the organization of a political Socialist movement should wait until the soil becomes ready to receive the Socialist seed. For the true cause of the backwardness of the American Socialist movement one must obviously look elsewhere.

The chief weakness of the Socialist movement in presenting its case to the people of the United States has been a mental weakness. The American Socialist mind, as a rule, does not survey with unbiased eye the rottenness of the present social system, and inductively frame a program to remedy it. Rather, our Socialist mind generally absorbs the analyses of Karl Marx, and deductively applies the answer of half a century past to the facts of today. Even where the Socialist movement in the United States has broken away from Marxism, it is not a break with the Marxian mental processes. Most American Socialists reach the Socialist answer by dint of first pondering Marx, next applying him to the modern social system, and then retaining as much of him as possible. The result via Marx may finally be identical with the result via independent thought, but it arrives garbed in cumbersome and misleading trappings. Thus, when boiled down to workable phraseology, the orthodox Socialist or Marxian program may be summarized as Government Ownership and Management; but the orthodox Socialist or the Marxian usually rebels when his program is thus paraphrased. He has reached his conclusions by way of the economic interpretation of history, the class struggle and surplus value; and if he finally emerges from them into mere Government Ownership and Management, he feels vaguely that he might have reached that answer

without laborious resort to the Marxian philosophic trinity.

Even if the Marxian explanation of society could be accepted today by all students of society, accepted without qualification or amendment, no political movement could base its program on Marx and on Marx alone, and hope for success which should be more than transient. Unless the Marxian pronouncements be dowered with the infallibility which we generally ascribe only to Divinity, sooner or later some aspect of society's development would deviate, slightly or seriously, from the line of procedure predicted by the Father of Socialism. Then the Marxian movement would willy-nilly become nonplussed. Years of habituation to applying accepted doctrines to reality would render the movement intellectually incapable of framing a new doctrine and a new machinery adequate to meet the challenge of the new rebellious reality. The deductive mind inevitably becomes dogmatic, and it is pathetically helpless when faced by a novel and unprecedented situation. Indeed, almost every page of Marx gives forth evidence of such rudely overbearing intolerance of, and such extreme intellectual brutality toward, those with whom he differed as to give rise to a sharp suspicion that a movement based only on those pages can never develop the understanding and appreciation of its opponents'

motives without which stable success must be impossible.

What Marx did was to gather all the significant facts on which he could lay his grasping and sensitive fingers, and erect them into a structure whose magnificence and completeness must make the beholder gasp with admiration. But mankind's stubborn quest for truth has vitiated some of the facts upon which all its greatest teachers of the past have relied for their reasoning, and hence has vitiated much of that reasoning itself. And Marx would have been among the first to recognize that eventually some of the facts on which he had relied would be exposed as not facts at all, but as misconceptions; and that then his reasoning based on those facts would have to be thoroughly overhauled. The Marxian system is all the more vulnerable to the iconoclasm of Time because its constituent elements dovetail so closely that if one of them should be destroyed, the remainder would be as the proverbial chain with the one broken link. If Marx were alive today, he would be among those most eager to digest and utilize the new knowledge of human history and of social organization which has inevitably arisen since the publication of *Capital*, and much of which inevitably contradicts the conceptions from which the conclusions expressed in *Capital* were drawn. Certainly, he would have concentrated, not only on the struggle between economic classes, but also on the

struggle of men of all classes against their biologically inherited tendencies. For example, in a sane and exact evaluation of the discoveries of Freud, there would be no keener student than Karl Marx. If he were alive today, he would probably repeat with fervor what he is reported to have repeated during his lifetime: "Thank God, I am no Marxist."

✓ Few leaders have suffered so grievously from the zeal of their disciples as has Marx. If his disciples had been content to cherish their master as the modern biologists cherish Darwin—at the same time zealously preserving their intellectual independence—Marx might well have been regarded by future ages as the most beneficent of all single personal forces in the world since Jesus, instead of merely as one of the most, if not the most, stimulating. It was Marx's great achievement that he should have been practically the first thinker seriously to shatter the concepts on which the capitalist philosophy of the nineteenth century was founded. The soil he ploughed was well-nigh forest primeval; he had to clear it of its cluttering débris before he could sow his crop. And if crops of later sowers have seemed more abundant and more palatable, their abundance and tastiness have been made possible only by Marx's clearance and preparation of the ground. The notability and preciousness of that service there will be few to deny.

But it is inconceivable that a Socialist movement would not have arisen without Marx. It would have arisen inductively, rather than deductively; from the exigencies of day-by-day existence; and couched in terms and measures which would have made it more comprehensible and doubtless more palatable to the world at large. And there Marx's disciples wrought their evil. They insisted on a complete abdication in favor of his analyses and program. By dint of the astonishing earliness and comprehensiveness of their master's work, they were able to pre-empt the field. Those struggling toward the light of the socialist answer by dint of rude contact with the viciousness of capitalism, rather than by dint of abstract reasoning, found themselves anticipated. They were beaten into adherence by the strength of the organization of the Marxians, and were perforce compelled either to join it or to render themselves impotent. By the third decade of the twentieth century, a Socialist movement would surely have been on foot, Marx or no Marx; and it may well be pondered if its tangible achievements, and more particularly its hope of rapid growth and victory in the following decades, might not have been greater without Marx, just as it may well be pondered if there would not be more actual practice of the Christian teachings today had not the Church surrounded and absorbed them in its orthodox and rigid theology.

For, since Marx, students of society have learned that man individually and collectively must be studied psychologically as well as economically. Marx may not have relied so largely (as many of his critics are wont to assert) on the conception of the economic man, dominated by his economic self-interest. But he did rely upon the dominance of economic self-interest in organized society to an extent that is now seen to have been largely unwarranted. Even though economic self-interest may start the impulse which finally causes social groups such as nations to take action, yet the impulse often is psychologically redirected so as to escape in an action which is the direct antithesis of self-interest.

Consider, for example, the Socialist explanation of the motives of those Americans who were most anxious for the United States to declare war on Germany after the sinking of the *Lusitania*. For the strength or the weakness of the American Socialist movement can best be appreciated by examination of its reaction to the World War, the most stupendous single fact in modern history. If the Socialist movement of the United States could handle in an adequate fashion the situation produced by the possibility of America's entrance into the War, it could handle adequately most of the problems confronting it if it should suddenly be called upon to administer the Government. Conversely, if it should respond to that situation

by hopelessly inadequate and unreal explanations, it obviously lies under mental influences which are unreliable. Now, the stock and almost unanimous Socialist explanation of those who wished America to declare war in, say, 1916, was that of self-interest. Such persons were chiefly of the upper economic classes. They possessed large Allied investments; or were shareholders in munitions plants; or were fearsome that a German victory would compel the United States to make financial reparation for having sold munitions to the Allies, involving high taxation which would fall most heavily upon the American propertied and wealthy classes; or the industries in which they were financially interested were becoming by 1914 unable to meet the competition of the efficient German business methods, and would be enormously benefited by the collapse of Germany, and by the consequent weakening of German business and its hold upon the world markets coveted by American business; or they coveted German colonial territory which would supply their businesses with cheap raw materials; or they wanted an army and navy on a huge scale in order later to defend Capitalism against the onslaught of the workers.

And yet, if the Socialists had been more zealous to establish the truth than to justify a formula, they would have realized that the upper economic classes stood to gain less if the United States entered the war than if she preserved her neutrality.

True, there is little evidence that most so-called hard-headed business men are guided by their reason rather than by their emotions to a greater extent than, or even to the same extent as, the remainder of the population. But there is a small group of men at the hub of American business who can and normally do survey current issues with clear-headed understanding of their own interests, and from this small group largely emanate the opinions which usually become the opinions of most of the business world. It must therefore have been evident to big business that the entrance of the United States into the War would see the imposition of drastic income, excess profits and war profits taxation comparable to the taxation of the other belligerent Powers. Big business must have realized that the margin of profit on the munitions and other supplies it would sell to a belligerent United States would become less than the margin it was exacting from the Allied belligerents. The few clear-sighted business men could understand, and could make their followers understand, that the longer the war continued, the stronger would the Labor and Socialist movements become, the nearer would approach that day when a Labor or Socialist Government would overthrow the grasp of the privileged few on industry, and in the meantime the more considerable would be the concessions which the Labor and Socialist movements could exact from

Capital. Even before April 6, 1917, many young men of the American upper classes had enlisted in the Allied armies. Doubtless many of them so enlisted from love of adventure, for escape from a humdrum commercial life or from other equally mixed and intangible motives; but certainly their own economic self-interest would have retained most of them in American business pursuits, safe from the danger of sudden death or mutilation.

Now, in one sense the Socialists were undoubtedly correct in asserting that the earliest clamorers for American participation in the War were largely of the propertied classes. It was true that Capital was more prone than Labor, and probably more prone than Agriculture, to consider the sinking of the *Lusitania* a *casus belli*. For in the loss of the *Lusitania*, property as well as human lives were destroyed, and in addition the honor of the United States was definitely affronted. True, the horror at the loss of life on the *Lusitania* well outweighed the anger at the loss of property and at the insult, and probably was felt as strongly by one economic class as by another. And yet in addition the man of property could experience, vaguely and inarticulately, danger in and ire at the destruction of American property prior to, if not more deeply than, the propertyless American. Even the land-owning farmer could feel that his property was but slightly akin to the kind of property represented by the *Lusitania* and its

cargo, and could not resent the German violation of property rights so quickly and so strongly as the owner of stocks and bonds.

Again, in the domain of patriotic resentment at national insult, it would manifestly be inaccurate and unfair to assert that Labor and Agriculture finally rallied around the flag less earnestly than Capital. Nevertheless, it is probably both accurate and fair to suggest that the upper economic classes are generally the first to resent a national affront, just because they are more powerful in the country and own more of its wealth than do the middle and lower economic classes. A blow at the country is more of a blow at them than at other groups, just as they stand to lose more in the country's defeat than do most of the other groups. And, of course, the power of economic interest asserted itself in many other no less intangible, but no less compelling, impulses on the question of America's participation or continued neutrality in the war. For instance, membership in upper-class social life is open chiefly to the upper economic class; and thus an attitude toward the World War receiving its first stimulus from economic interest became identified with an attitude imposed by upper-class social conventions. The economic interpretation of history is certainly not the least substantial of the stones composing the Marxian arch; but the Socialist movement will come to grief, indeed, has already come to grief,

by not appreciating that impulses in the human bosom due to economic self-interest must run the gamut of so many illogical emotions before they come to the surface, that by that time they may become translated into actions diametrically opposed to economic self-interest.

Now that the holocaust is over, it has painfully become more and more incontrovertible that its underlying causes were economic. The expansion of national markets into international markets; the internationalization of capital, finance and credit; the competition between the big business units of one country and those of another country, in both cases supported by their Governments, for raw materials from the industrially undeveloped and politically helpless regions of the earth; the political subjugation of those countries in order to attain the subjugation of their Labor, these were the primary factors responsible for the division of Europe into an armed camp on the balance of power system,—and from that system only a great international military struggle could finally flow. Even the militarism of Germany and Germany's boorish aggressiveness had their roots deep down in the lateness and extreme rapidity with which the industrial revolution developed in that country. But these were the factors influencing but the few who developed the system; they affected but slightly the decision of the masses in the respective belligerent countries

to support the war and to see it through. And without that decision of the masses, the War would have been impossible. How important a rôle in causing the War was played, for instance, by the feeling for nationality, and how illogically and sentimentally free from economic considerations of self-interest is that national consciousness!

Only in such psychological terms can the popular support and prosecution of the War, and the popular attitude toward the peace, be explained. Very tediously has man built up inhibitions against the savage impulses which dominated him when he swung by his tail in the tree-tops, and those inhibitions are still in their incipient and feeble stage. At those moments when the savage impulses are roused from their slumber, the barriers against them collapse all too readily before their onslaught. And the inhibitions necessitated by our development out of the state of greater savagery are unpleasant as well as weak. We chafe against their restrictions upon us, become increasingly irritable when the restrictions remain unbroken unduly long, and consciously or unconsciously hope for the day when once more the impulses of the tree-top days can reign unchecked. We itch to hate, to torture, to kill, to punish. To dwell in peace and amity with our neighbors becomes a severe strain, and the longer the peace and amity the severer the strain. Those

of our neighbors who differ from us in appearance, speech, habits, or outlook on life are particularly obnoxious, for their dissimilarity from us impresses us as a direct insult to and attack on our own appearance, our own speech, our own habits, our own outlook on life, and hence as an insult to and an attack on us; and when War with them threatens, we secretly exult—Up, the War!

So the war against Germany. How fervently the people of the United States, after some months in war, hissed the assertion they had applauded when they entered the struggle, that we had no quarrel with the German people, but only with the German Government! How irresistibly they swept their President along to declare in the summer of 1919 that the German people were responsible for the crimes of their Government, the same President who had solemnly declared in the spring of 1917 that they were not thus responsible! While we were neutral, most of us agreed that the best peace after the war would be a peace without victory. While we were belligerents, we scorned the very phrase—the case for a peace without victory was as good after April 6, 1917, as before it, but we no longer desired the best peace. We wanted the peace that would best satiate our wholly-released savage instinct to apply the maximum punishment to our opponent. Was our deliberate starvation of German women

and children for months after the armistice un-Christian and barbarous?—We rejoiced that we had overthrown the Christian repressions and we wallowed exultingly in our barbarian orgy of hate. Did we obscenely lie about Soviet Russia, unnecessarily blockade it, unethically invade it?—What matter? Had it not helped our enemies, and at all events, did it not have conceptions radically different from ours? Did we solemnly pledge to Germany certain terms of peace if she should surrender, and then solemnly scatter our pledges to the wind as so many scraps of paper?—Well, hadn't we won and the Germans lost? And how much more satisfactory and pleasant to break than to preserve awkward pledges to our enemies! Did the Allies' peace-terms really redound to their own disadvantage by crippling Germany so that she couldn't pay her debts to them?—It was more delightful to gratify our hate to our own hurt than to thwart our hate to our own advantage.—To explain a nation's actions on the brink of, during, and after a war by economic motives has proved as inadequate as explaining childbirth by the story of the Garden of Eden. A war transforms a twentieth-century nation into a prehistoric nation; it invalidates almost every disquisition which might have been true of the nation in the pre-war days; in the twinkling of an eye, it eclipses Marx by the old Adam. In the face of war, the reasoning of the non-Socialist pacifists

proved far more reliable than that of the non-pacifist Socialists.

A less debatable and less disputatious example may be afforded by the recent agitation for armed intervention in Mexico. The Socialists explain that agitation, and attempt to meet it, on the ground that it is inspired only by motives of pecuniary gain. Now, the mainspring of that agitation is, of course, the protection of American property in Mexico; so that naturally no surprise arises when the enthusiasm for intervention is found chiefly among the upper economic classes, with the middle economic classes lukewarm to the project, and with Labor and Agriculture inclined to be antagonistic. And yet no argument is required to prove that only a minute section of the propertied class would be directly benefited by intervention in Mexico, and that the great majority of the propertied class bent on intervention would stand to lose by it. The difficulties of the task would obviously be prodigious, and the length of time required would be great, so that the expense of the adventure would be enormous. And the propertied class cherishes no illusion that the greater part of that expense could be met except by taxation which would fall most heavily upon them. Certainly, the great majority of the propertied class possesses no share of American investments in Mexico, and it may well be doubted if most of the interventionists are sufficiently

clear-visioned and far-sighted to appreciate that the investments they have made outside of Mexico might eventually become more valuable by dint of cheaper oil, cheaper coal, and, primarily, cheaper and unorganized labor from the occupation of Mexico. Probably more of them realize that American business interests would be injured by the anger in South America at an attack upon Mexico.

Their enthusiasm for intervention has probably come to the surface rather by way of "consciousness of kind," the clan instinct. They are aware that there are owners of property in Mexico who stand to gain by intervention or, more pertinently, who may stand to suffer serious loss without intervention. (It is irrelevant that this possibility of property loss without intervention may not be well-founded—propaganda has made it as real to the minds of the propertied interventionists as if it were undeniable.) They also are owners of property; and although their property is not in Mexico, yet they vaguely feel a kinship binding them to the Mexican property-holders. That feeling of kinship is rendered all the stronger by the recognition of the intensity of the class struggle in this day and generation, and by the consciousness that all those who have are being attacked all over the world by all those who have not. It is the like-calling-to-like instinct, the awareness of a common bond, functioning today on Mexico as

several decades ago, and still in the sentimental fiction of today, it functioned so as to impel the Kentucky mountaineer to defend his cousin from the law-officer, even to the apparent injury of his own interests. And the social bond also makes its strength felt. The owners of Mexican property adhere chiefly to the upper social classes; it becomes almost social treason, almost a breach of social etiquette, for the remainder of those classes not to fall in with a movement so dear and so valuable to their fellows.

It is not only in thus sticking too rigidly to the economic interpretation of history that the Socialist Party of America has rendered its attitude toward current phenomena and movements so largely futile. Its interpretation of events and hence its ability to assume a position of leadership in the United States are weakened by a too literal application of the class struggle doctrine. Now, there can be little doubt that the capitalist system is permeated through and through by a conflict between those who primarily own and those who primarily work. So long as one group in the community owns most of the property and capital necessary to production, and another group, with no such ownership, must sell its labor to the first group, so long will the interests of the two groups conflict at many points. Until ownership in production belongs either to both groups engaged in production, or to neither group, or until the two

groups coalesce into one group which shall be at the same time both owners and workers, so long will Capital be able to feather its own nest to a great extent only at the expense of Labor, and to a great extent Labor its nest only at the expense of Capital. And any qualification that might be demanded in this statement will be all in favor of Labor. For although Capital can obviously benefit itself by exploiting Labor, yet Capital can in many ways avoid injury if Labor should exploit it by means of throwing the incidence of that exploitation upon the shoulders of the general public.

✓ And yet the class struggle works too loosely for implicit reliance on it as a never-failing guide to the interpretation of events in the United States. In the first place, the Marxian two-class idea has manifestly been exploded. Marx, it will be recalled, prophesied, and built his brilliant system partly around the prophecy, that the development of capitalism would be accompanied by the gradual but steady disappearance of the middle-class. Capital would tend toward overwhelming concentration in a few hands, while the remainder of the population would become dispossessed proletarians, increasingly exploited and increasingly miserable. Now, it is probably in the United States that the first part of this prophecy has been most thoroughly verified; for the trusts of the United States have developed largely as Marx foresaw. And yet it is probably in the United

States that the second part of this prophecy has been most thoroughly discredited, for our middle economic class has most persistently refused to disappear. Indeed, it is likely that the middle class in the United States has even proportionately increased since Marx's day. As between Capital and Labor, the struggle is doubtless inevitable, and possibly destined to become increasingly intense, until the capital and ownership necessary in production and distribution become public capital and ownership. But the United States still supports an extremely large middle-class, which in many localities is so numerous that it decides political elections, the economic interests of which are strongly bound up with the economic interests of neither Labor nor Capital, and hence the actions of which, and therefore the actions of the nation as a whole, cannot be understood merely by a recognition of the class struggle.

Secondly, the people who inhabit the United States are social animals to a greater extent than they are economic men. They are intimately and closely bound together in social groups, the affiliations of which hold them in stricter bondage than their business or economic affiliations. Even the exceptional business man who braves business hostility by breaking business conventions will quake at the mere thought of breaking the social conventions of his social group. The independent of spirit and revolutionary of actions between 10

A.M. and 5 P.M. become as dependent of spirit and servile of action between 6.30 P.M. and midnight as the dependent and servile through the entire twenty-four hours. Acting so as to gain the applause and escape the censure of all our immediate groups, we yet heed the social group more obediently than the business group. Of course, the social group has cohered chiefly from the same economic class, but "chiefly" and not "wholly." Considerations of family history and intellectual achievement or position often enter, and on occasion lack of social graces and *savoir faire* will make even the economically eligible ineligible for membership. Even the extent to which social grouping follows economic grouping is due largely not to any snobbish desire to exclude the less fortunate, but to the social awkwardness which arises when one member of a party is unable to meet, or will suffer by meeting, his share of expenditures which rest lightly upon the others. The upper economic classes are apt to exclude from their social functions the individual of the middle economic class primarily because the former knows, and knows that the latter knows, that the latter cannot well repay a social obligation in kind. Again economic status becomes modified by the grouping which finally dominates and determines action.

The class consciousness which the undeniable class struggle has produced is thus much more

a social class consciousness than an economic class consciousness. One has only to look at most of the political campaigns in the United States, particularly in the municipal and state elections, to realize that fact. The bulk of the electorate, middle economic class and lower economic class, dislikes a "silk stocking" more than a "plute." If the candidate seems upper class by social affiliation, and more particularly by personality, although not of the upper class financially, his case is more desperate than if his worldly possessions are great, but his social affiliations and personality seem of the earth, earthy. Theodore Roosevelt might have been of the multi-millionaires, with large investments in all of our trusts, without thereby losing any appreciable amount of his remarkably tenacious hold upon the rank and file of America. Likewise, the college professor of the type dear to cartoonists, or the Bostonian *Mayflower* descendant of the type dear to professional humorists, would find the popular mind arrayed against him, no matter how slim his bank account. "Al" Smith defeats his Republican rival for the Governorship of New York State, in an otherwise Republican year, largely by dint of repeating that he was a worker while his opponent was a college student; and it was chiefly the proletariat which supported Henry Ford for Senator from Michigan. And when the innate resentment against the upper classes can readily be gal-

vanized, with the result of gaining votes, it is the Republican or Democratic politician who arouses it and corrals the votes. He does so by an appeal to the consciousness of social kind, while the Socialist propaganda, by printed or spoken word, based on consciousness of economic kind falls flat and deaf upon the ears of most of the very proletariat. Until the Socialist Party of America can attune its appeal largely to social class grouping rather than solely to economic class grouping, its vote will continue to be chiefly a mere protest vote.

Thus, to revert again to the problem presented the Socialists by the possibility of America's participation in the World War, the Socialist Party of America signally failed to evaluate adequately the impulses, worthy or unworthy, which finally inclined most Americans to the cause of the Entente Allies. The question as to whether Socialist opposition to American participation was justified or unjustified is for the moment beside the point. Granted that the Socialists had determined upon opposition, the problem was to understand what to oppose; and by concentrating upon the economic factor, the Socialists overlooked the power and effect of social grouping in the United States. For the ability of the upper social circles *qua* upper social circles to mould, dominate and guide public opinion in the United States can hardly be overestimated. Now, in the upper social circles in this country, the French and the British before

August 1, 1914, and before April 6, 1917, played, as they still play, prominent rôles, more prominent than the rôles played by the Germans. Similarly, Americans of British and of French descent were everywhere to be found in "high society," whereas our "German-Americans" had acclimated themselves chiefly to the middle-class social life. Even wealthy "German-Americans," on the whole, were conspicuous largely by their absence in "high society." Moreover, the United States had been systematically and efficiently tapped for succor to Belgium. In order to raise the largest possible amount for the Belgian relief, recourse for funds was had, quite legitimately, to the power of upper social grouping; and obviously it was impossible to feel pity for the Belgians, even where that pity had to be artificially stimulated, without feeling resentment against those who were primarily responsible for the plight of the Belgians.

I am not maintaining that the American Socialists' course of action could have been shaped differently or more effectively if they had been intellectually capable of recognizing the true alignment of the forces against them. The question is simply one of demonstrating how the Socialist Party, through complete reliance upon the economic interpretation of history and the economic class struggle, was led into false appreciation and evaluation of the most serious crisis in America's history which it could possibly have been called

upon to face. And the class struggle and the economic interpretation of history are probably the least vulnerable points of the Marxian system. It is an ungracious task to pick flaws in one of the confessedly most notable achievements in the entire intellectual history of the race, dazzling in its brilliancy, stirring in its comprehensiveness, awe-inspiring in its originality. And yet the truth is that the Marxian explanation of panics and the Marxian labor theory of value have likewise proved inadequate. Most of our business depressions doubtless could have been explained by the Marxian diagnosis of preceding overproduction, but other causes also have had their effect—in particular, currency and credit inflation. Indeed, probably only measures looking toward deflation forestalled a panic in the United States in 1920, a panic which would have occurred at a time when the United States and the entire world was clamoring for increased production as a result of the preceding five years of underproduction of necessities. Similarly, the Marxian theory of surplus value in its pristine form has been sincerely rejected by most economists, and the few who have been able to accept it have been obliged to do so only with reservations. The proportion of the value of goods due to the labor spent on producing them is incontrovertibly greater than the share from the sale of them now given to the workers for that labor, but all their value can

hardly be assigned to the labor utilized on them.

Moreover, even if the Marxian surplus value creed were flaw-proof, for the practical purposes of a political platform and the conversion of the bulk of the electorate in political and educational campaigns, it would be useless. For as Marx presented it, it is and must remain quite incomprehensible to all except the initiate. So far as the realizable aims of the Socialist movement in America are concerned, no theory which is totally beyond the mental capabilities of the bulk of the populace need be considered true. There is a common-sense theory of surplus value which maintains that Labor is paid too little and Capital too much for their respective shares in production and distribution; and since this theory may be made to appeal to the understanding of the electorate, and since Marx's theory of surplus value cannot be so made to appeal, for the purposes of the Socialist political program the common-sense theory is true and the Marxian theory is not true. It is idle to instance in rebuttal of this point of view the picture of Darwin shaking the whole world from his hilltop by his enunciation of new and revolutionizing biological truths. Darwin's task was merely to convince the men of science—laymen, confessing their inability to pass judgment upon biology, would finally accept the verdict of the professional scientific minds upon evolution, after their first hectic and involuntary rallying

to the support of the Bible. And the Darwinian theory of evolution was comprehensible to the minds of the men of science. But in the realm of politics, under our system of democracy to which the Socialist Party of America renders allegiance, the jury is everybody, and it accepts no one's judgment but its own, or what it believes to be its own. If the majority of American voters are to register approval of the Marxian theory of surplus value, they must first understand it; and since they cannot possibly understand it, the Socialist movement in the United States may well relegate that theory to the limbo of the seminar and the library.

No thought-system of the past can be completely relied upon for guidance, no matter how magnificent, no matter how adequate for the generation which ushered it in and for the immediately following generations, no matter whether it be Christianity or Marxism. The Socialist Party of America, until it can free itself from the Marxian cast of thought, can hardly attain or deserve to attain a position of leadership in America.

CHAPTER V.

THE SOCIALISTS AND THE WAR.

THE inevitable result of this dogmatically deductive cast of Socialist thought in the United States is nowhere more vividly typified than in the Socialist attitude toward the participation of the United States in the World War. For this reason, an extended scrutiny of that attitude will be remunerative. As above, for the sake of the argument, the question of the rectitude and advisability of Socialist opposition to America's participation may be ignored. Granted that, from the Socialist point of view, support of America's war against Germany was out of the question, on what grounds, by what reasoning and in what manner could and should the Socialist Party have withheld its support of the War?

The Party's answer to this query is embodied in the so-called War Platform adopted by special convention at St. Louis on April 11, 1917, five days after the United States was officially at war with the Imperial German Government. By the provisions of the constitution of the Socialist Party, the platform after adoption by the conven-

tion had to be submitted to a referendum of the Party membership. It was so submitted, together with the minority or pro-war resolution; and the announcement that the majority anti-war platform had been ratified by the referendum, and thus finally adopted by the Party, was made on July 7, 1917.

But before entering upon a discussion of the St. Louis Platform, I must crave the indulgence of a personal admission that I do so only with diffidence. Diffidence arises not merely from the fear that one may be but wise-after-the-event; but also from the realization that, however sincerely a writer in 1921 may attempt to re-create for his discussion the conditions obtaining in 1917, the solemn and depressing events of the elapsing four years cannot be altogether shoved out of consciousness. At all events, one personal statement at this point is due the reader no less than the writer. Although disapproving of much of the course of action it demanded, as a member of the Socialist Party I voted for the adoption of the St. Louis Platform in 1917: and today, still a member of the Socialist Party, if faced again by the predicament existing in 1917 and with no other alternative available than that available in 1917, I should today, still a member of the Socialist Party and still reluctantly, again vote for its adoption.

Before passing directly to a consideration of

the statements of the St. Louis Platform, however, it may be profitable to notice the date of its formulation. The convention by which the platform was adopted did not assemble until five days after the President of the United States had asked Congress to pass a resolution declaring a state of war with the Imperial German Government. That he would make such a request was no secret. Since the dismissal of Ambassador von Bernstorff in the preceding February, it was evident that war would be declared—indeed, President Wilson's action in calling a special session of Congress was eloquent of purpose. Now, any course pursued by the Socialist Party of America or by any other organization desiring to exert influence on America's entrance into the War would be effective only if taken before the request to declare war and the consequent proclamation of War. That was particularly true if the course pursued were to be in opposition to war participation. For, as the Socialists have learned to their cost, opposition to war before the die has been cast is tolerated to an infinitely greater degree than opposition once war has been declared. As a matter of fact, the St. Louis Platform proved to be ineffective, but it was ineffective largely because it was framed and adopted after the United States had entered the war. If it had been blared forth before April 2, or even before April 6, 1917, it would not have been so altogether fruitless as it

proved in affecting public opinion in the United States.

Now, obviously there must be something woefully deficient in the mental and administrative capacity of a political party twenty years old which has no machinery available to handle a long-impending and long-foreseen national crisis until too late for action to be effective. For various causes, adequate or inadequate, the national convention of the Socialist Party which should normally have met in the Presidential year 1916 was omitted. In spite of that fact, no central executive body was empowered to state the Party's position even subject to a later referendum, should Germany's grudging promises anent a restricted submarine warfare be disregarded, and should the United States accordingly be dragged into war. There was even no machinery available for calling an emergency convention at short notice—the St. Louis gathering did not finally convene until more than two months after von Bernstorff had been handed his passports. The reason lay in the all-pervading Socialist mistrust of leadership, even its own leadership. The constitution of the Party provided and still provides that practically every significant action, and many insignificant actions, must be determined by a referendum of the Party membership. And whatever the undeniable virtues of referenda, they do

not make for sane and rapid action in face of an emergency.

Let it be granted that it would have been grossly improper to commit the Party with finality to a position on the War without registering the votes of the Party membership. Nevertheless, there was dire need for the Party to be placed tentatively on record before War or Peace was voted upon—as, in fact, for all practical purposes the Party was committed to its course on the War by the adoption of the War Platform by the St. Louis Convention, even before it was ratified by the referendum. It was the tardiness in convening the St. Louis Convention which was criminally negligent; and it is little defense to explain that the date on which the special session of Congress was to meet had been advanced several weeks. A well-organized trade union calls a national strike only with the assent of the membership in a referendum, but also it gives the central executive the authority to make the decision under certain circumstances which can be foretold.

The experiences of the last decades with the application of political democracy have shown that effectiveness is impossible unless the leaders have authority and responsibility; and the political organization which cannot in less than two months even preliminarily take a position on a vital question where “time is of the essence” is a political organization which must still travel a long dis-

tance before it can be trusted with power. In no Socialist Local whose meetings I happen to have attended (and I can speak merely from my own experience) has there been machinery for handling efficiently even the routine business of a ward organization. Small printers' bills, payment for rent and light, the phraseology of a letter to a delinquent Comrade, all are thrown open to the discussion of a full meeting. One reason why Socialist Locals are largely futile in converting their neighborhoods is that they are usually so poorly organized that it is almost midnight before even the routine business of inner picayune administration has been disposed of. It is the inevitable result of a mental outlook focussed on a dogma. The mind which trusts the analyses of a nineteenth-century Marx to interpret twentieth-century events is involuntarily disposed to meet the demand for immediate and concrete action by means of uncritical reliance upon an abstract principle of action such as the referendum. The Socialist Party of America could not release itself from its shackles of involved and lengthy procedure, even to register opposition to its most hideous nightmare, War, before it was too late, because its mental processes were not flexible.

After which preamble, the St. Louis Resolution itself may be considered. It opens by an analysis of the underlying causes of the War as a whole which will be less and less vigorously disputed as

the terms of the Treaties of Peace impress themselves more and more firmly upon popular understanding. Even the pro-war liberals, whose condemnation of the St. Louis Resolution was based on reasoning rather than on emotional anger, admit that "If you want to know what a war was about, study the terms of its peace." And a study of the terms of peace of the Treaties of Versailles, St. Germain and Sèvres is sufficient to endorse the St. Louis Resolution's assertion that the fundamental cause of the War was the economic and financial rivalries between the great Powers. However, the dogmatism of the St. Louis Resolution led it to ignore the rôle, if only a subsidiary rôle, played in causing the War by psychological and even illogical factors of an uneconomic kind. It is futile to attempt to account for the World War, for instance, without paying respects to the force of hatreds of one race by another, even of one nation by another nation of the same race. It is even futile to attempt to account for all of that hatred by economic considerations, just as it would be futile to attempt to account for much of it without economic considerations. The internecine economic and financial rivalries of international Capitalism account for all the Serbian hatred of the Austro-Germans of the old Austro-Hungarian monarchy, for all the French hatred of the Germans, for all the German hatred of the Russians, as inadequately as they account for all

the Irish hatred of British rule or for all the consequent anti-British feeling in the United States.

Furthermore, if the Socialist Party in its platform on American participation in the World War saw fit to maintain that one group of belligerents was as little worthy of support by the working-class as the other, it could have founded that position on a much firmer rock than the re-echo of the old war-cry against the deep-laid plots of international capitalists. It might well have analyzed the well-being of the masses and the extent of the distribution of happiness in the Entente countries as contrasted with the well-being and happiness-distribution in the Central Empires.

On this whole question of war culpability, however, the great mass of Americans would have been influenced most readily, and justifiably so, by the determination as to whether Germany was actually the direct instigator of the War. To all pacifist and Socialist reasoning on America's participation, the man in the street inevitably retorted, "Well, answer me this—didn't Germany begin the War?" It was therefore highly essential that the St. Louis Resolution should be meticulously explicit in its charge that the most influential cause of the War was the international capitalist system. The mere reiteration of the phrase in general terms was not enough. There should have been concrete explanation of the way in which and why the markets of the world had become interna-

tional markets. Of the reasons why all the great industrial Powers were in febrile competition for raw materials from the economically undeveloped regions of the earth. Of the reasons why they thus sought political control of those regions. Of the way in which and why control of waterways like the Dardanelles was the cause of intricate international machinations by a Power like Tsarist Russia, which was an agricultural rather than an industrial Power. Of the way in which the business interests of the great Powers could exploit Labor in colonies as they could not exploit it at home, and of the consequent advantages of the business interests of Powers with colonies over those of Powers without colonies. Of the international ramifications of Finance. And, finally and above all, of the practical control of the governments of all the great belligerent nations by their business and financial interests.

These explanations should have been immediately supported by concrete examples. There were enough to hand. For instance, the part played by economic factors in causing the Russo-Japanese War; the international ownership of munition plants; particularly, the reasons why possession of Morocco had almost set off the War in 1905 and again in 1911; the political and economic slicing-up of China by all the great European Powers. In passing, such an exposition would have constituted the most valuable propa-

ganda which the Socialist Party could have sown. For the Party's propaganda had been comparatively barren of results, both because it had not been able to reach a sufficient proportion of the population, and because it had been couched in terms too vague to admit of popular comprehension. Obviously, such an anti-war resolution as here outlined, adopted before the declaration of war, would have been spread broadcast over the country, and would have explained the import of the Socialist doctrine by timely and comprehensible applications. Also, it may be noted that this general inculcation of Socialist philosophy into the body politic might have served to hasten the Socialist recovery from the unpopularity which opposition to America's participation in the War was bound to cause.

Even then, of course, the man in the street would have demanded, "Well, maybe you Socialists are right about the underlying cause of the War, but can you deny that Germany was the immediate cause?" Certainly, even without such a query, the Socialist Party was impelled by its position on the War to analyze the immediate as well as the underlying causes of the struggle. By the time of the St. Louis Convention, the diplomatic correspondence preceding the major declarations of war was available for dissection, even though probably only in expurgated form. As against the damning evidence of German support of the

provocative Austro-Hungarian ultimatum to Serbia, the Socialist Party's best, if not only, card was an exposition of Russia's guilt in causing general German mobilization, which had long been accepted in all well-informed European circles as the well-nigh inevitable precursor of a German declaration of war on Russia. Many American minds which were quite passed over by the St. Louis Resolution's phrases regarding Capitalism's responsibility for causing the War would have been caught by a searchlight on Russia's mobilization on the German border as well as on the Austro-Hungarian border before Germany had yet ordered even partial mobilization. Those minds would have been even more firmly caught by a searchlight on the ensuing Russian failure even to answer, within the time-limit set, the German ultimatum demanding cessation of the Russian mobilization, in spite of the fact that Germany had informed Russia that the ultimatum itself was very near a declaration of war.

At this point, it may be noted that the Socialist Party did not oppose an American declaration of war against Germany because the Socialists were pacifists. The St. Louis Platform declares that the only war in which the working-class will be justified in engaging is a war between the classes. By definite implication, therefore, the St. Louis Platform pledges its support to a war which may arise to settle the class struggle. The Platform

also asserts that recent wars have always been "made by the classes and fought by the masses," and that "in all modern history there has been no war more unjustifiable than the one in which we are about to engage." Concerning these exaggerations, it is, of course, possible to be hypercritical; for in a protest platform adopted on the brink of war, a certain amount of hyperbole is inevitable. But these statements are more than hyperbole—they are the kind of sweeping and inaccurate generalities which throw discredit upon any document in which they appear.

It may furnish an anti-war orator emotional satisfaction, as well as a text, to declare that all wars are "made by the classes, and fought by the masses"; but that declaration is certainly not true of the last war. In a country like England, the social pressure which largely compelled enlistment in the pre-conscription days was more effective upon the classes than upon the masses. Proportionately, the classes probably enlisted in more generous numbers than did the masses, although it is probably true also that the classes went largely into the ranks of the officers, who, after all, suffered less in the fighting than did the privates. And after the adoption of conscription in the United States as well as in England, the call to the colors fell alike upon class and mass. (Escape from fighting because of social and economic upper class membership was probably more prev-

alent in France than in the United States or in England.) And the ratio of those who were enabled to stay at home because of the essential character of their work was certainly no lower among the ranks of Labor than among the ranks of Capital.

On the other hand, little exception may be taken to the assertion that "in all modern history there has been no war more unjustifiable than that in which we are about to engage." Considering the impetuous advance of human knowledge since the last previous great international war; the steady multiplication of international ties and understandings; the comparatively increased material well-being of mankind; the absence of any direct oppression or of redemption of national honor as a pressing *casus belli*; the power of the organizations and organisms working toward international peace; the fact that the war sprang as the culmination of a complicated, carefully-planned and well-constructed division of Europe into two armed camps on the Balance of Power system; the fact that the European dynamite had very nearly been set off into the explosion of war by the Moroccan spark of 1905, the Bosnian and Herzegovinian spark of 1908, the second Moroccan spark of 1911, the Turko-Italian war spark of 1911 and the Balkan Wars sparks of 1912-13; the fact that each of these sparks had crept nearer the dynamite than its predecessor; the fact that

therefore the explosion of 1914 could almost with certainty have been foretold and therefore prevented—in view of these considerations, the war in which the United States was about to engage when the St. Louis Resolution was adopted was verily as unjustifiable as few wars of history.

But the language of this section of the Resolution was obscure. It was particularly obscure when read in the context of the preceding and following statements that to satisfy the capitalists' greed for gain, they had dragged America into war against the will of the American people. And it was obscure when read in the high emotion and unreason of war-times. I have met Socialists, and altogether there must have been thousands of them, who were sincerely and immovably under the impression that the St. Louis Anti-War Resolution, for which they had voted, asserted that it was America's entrance into the lists against the German Government which was unprecedentedly unjustified. Outside of the Socialist ranks, even many of those who were above being stampeded by one hundred per cent American patriotic anti-Socialist propaganda were under the same impression. And obviously America's declaration of war against Germany was more fully justified than most war declarations in the past had been. If the Socialists wished to maintain that all such declarations of war were unjustified; that war because of insult to national honor was as obsolete

as duels because of insult to personal honor; that hence nothing vital was at stake save the predominance of one group of nations' capitalist system over another and similar group's capitalist system—that position might well have been defended. But if any wars of the past have been justified merely on the grounds of national avengement of national insult and of violated national rights, our war on the Imperial German Government was so justified.

There has already been discussed, in Chapter IV, the unreality of the St. Louis Resolution's charge that America's participation in the War was due to the machinations of America's capitalist class. The latter part of the Resolution may therefore next be considered. It is concerned with the course of action to which the Socialist Party of America pledged itself; and it is this part to which the sharpest exception may be taken by even an anti-war member of the Socialist Party. The Party pledged itself to "continuous, active and public opposition to the War . . . through all means in our power." To opposition to the enactment of conscription; and, should it nevertheless come, to "the support of all mass movements in opposition to conscription." Finally, the Party pledged itself to "oppose with all our strength" any attempt to raise money for war by taxing the necessities of life or by issuing bonds.

Now, at the time when the St. Louis Resolution

was framed, the Socialist Party of America, by the very essence of its existence as a political party, placed, as it still places, its chief reliance upon political action for the accomplishment of its ends. It differs from the syndicalists, the I. W. W., the anarchists, the cooperatives, the Bolsheviks, and the American Federation of Labor, in that it concentrates its efforts upon the verdict of the ballot-box. In other words, it subscribes to the principles of political democracy. By those principles, the minority is pledged to accept the verdict of the majority, so long as the majority does not interfere with the minority's effort, by political procedure, to make itself the majority. But the course of action imposed on the Socialist Party by the St. Louis Resolution was in direct opposition to the principles of political democracy, and hence to the idea on which the Socialist Party itself is founded. In opposition to the prosecution of the War, to the enactment and enforcement of military and industrial conscription, to the imposition of war taxation on necessities, to collection of war loans, the Party pledged itself to go beyond its right to agitate for the repeal of the objectionable legislation by appeals to and education of the electorate. It pledged itself to more than demonstrations and petitions. It pledged itself to "mass movements" and all other means within its power (whether or not within its prerogative).

All due regard may be given to the looseness of phraseology to be expected from a special convention of a mere protesting organization still without any responsibility or power in the procedure of governing the nation; to the fact that the platform was framed by a hastily-chosen committee, which had to formulate it in such eloquent language as would earn the commendation of an excited and excitable open convention of more than one hundred persons; to the warmth of controversial feeling which pervaded the country at the time the St. Louis Resolution was framed. And yet, with all regard to pardonable exuberance of language, in its stand on the War the Socialist Party went over to the direct actionists. Although an insignificant minority in the country, it pledged itself to disregard the registered decision of the vast majority, and to upset that decision before and without obtaining a mandate to that effect by the democratic procedure of a show of hands. The Socialist Party was willing to achieve its ends by use of its sheer power in exactly the method which it is the first and the loudest to condemn when that method is employed by the Steel Corporation, by the capitalist Press, by a group of bankers or by a strike-breaking agency.

Of the course of action demanded by the St. Louis Resolution, one defense, and one only, is open to the Socialist Party. The Party may base its disregard of the procedure of political democ-

racy on the grounds that that procedure had already been disregarded by the Republican and Democratic Parties in their declaration of war. The Congress which declared war had been elected in time of peace, when America seemed to have extricated herself from the danger of being drawn into the European holocaust. Indeed, in that election the Democratic administration of President Wilson had been endorsed by the electorate after a campaign in which the Democrats had relied largely upon the slogan, "He kept us out of war." In that campaign, the Republicans, who had upbraided President Wilson for not taking a firmer stand toward the Imperial German Government, had been rejected by the voters of the country. With much show of justice, the St. Louis Resolution might have insisted that only by an advisory referendum, or by the results of a number of representative special Congressional elections in different sections of the country, would the principle of political democracy have been previously observed in the declaration of war. Objection had been raised to an advisory referendum on Peace or War because no machinery for it was available, and because it would be impossible to create that machinery with speed and adequate safeguards against fraud. But that that objection was invalid was proved by our rapid creation of machinery for the far more difficult and more complicated procedure of registration for the draft. Indeed,

in view of my strictures on the St. Louis Resolution, at this point I again crave indulgence for a personal reference. I believed in April, 1917, and believe today, although naturally the belief cannot be substantiated, that a Peace-or-War referendum held before Congress had declared war on the Imperial German Government, a referendum in which women would have voted on the same terms as men, would have declared for peace.

But the Socialist Party's War creed indulged in no direct reference to a referendum, nor to any other politically democratic method of determining the will of the majority of American voters on the question of war. With such a reference, opposition to the prosecution of the War by the United States might not have flown so flagrantly in the face of democratic procedure. Without it, the Socialist Party was itself declaring war—war on the political system of the country. For to stop our prosecution of the war, the St. Louis Resolution was relying on a naked test of strength—Socialist strength versus Government (or, if you will, capitalist) strength. And in a test of sheer strength by resort to war, the vanquished can hardly object to being disarmed by the victor. Since the Socialists were appealing to mass action in order to paralyze the Government's (or the capitalists') strength, they could hardly object with propriety when the Government (or the capitalists) in return, in order to paralyze the Socialist

strength, appealed to mass action such as imprisonment and denial of mail privileges. I need hardly add that it is one thing to render war objectors impotent to injure the program of the majority during the prosecution of a war, and quite another thing to inflict ten and twenty years' jail sentences upon them as punishment for merely voicing their disagreement.

Nor could the Socialist Party, in defence of the St. Louis Resolution, fairly point to the sabotage of public opinion by Capitalism through the press and the pulpit and the movie theatre. It may be true that the processes of political democracy depend for their validity upon a public opinion which has access to the truth; and that at present most or many of the agencies which spread information before the people distort the truth. But if the Socialist Party is determined to play the game of political democracy, it must abide by the rules of the game. (If not, let it previously announce that it does not intend to abide by them and take the consequences, as did the Communist Party and the Communist Labor Party.) If the capitalist pulpit, the capitalist press and the capitalist movie will not impart the truth about the Socialist movement, the Socialist movement must organize its own press, its own pulpit and its own movies. By the rules of the game of political democracy, resort to propaganda *qua* propaganda is quite legitimate; the quintessence of political democracy is

to be found in the contest between the most highly-developed propagandas. When one's opponent resorts to propaganda, one is justified, not in abandoning the game, but in resorting to counter-propaganda, and may the best propaganda win! If the Socialist Party should achieve political control in the United States, and, even illegitimately, should use that control to influence public opinion, the Socialist Party would nevertheless be well within its rights in suppressing the Capitalist Parties if the Capitalist Parties used that influencing of public opinion as an excuse for disregarding the verdict of the ballot-box, and attempted to overthrow Socialism by means of such mass action as an artificially-created business panic.

Accordingly, it is more than wisdom-after-the-event to suggest that the Socialist Party of America could have expressed its opposition to America's participation in the War on grounds more fundamental than those of the St. Louis Resolution, more convincing to the great majority of the American electorate, and more fully in accord with the principles and practise of Socialism itself. Surely, even in March, 1917, the war platform of the Socialist Party, after tracing and proving the economic origin of the War and the overwhelmingly economic character of the true issues at stake in the War, after analyzing the immediate events which led directly to the outbreak of hostilities, and after making other points which the framers

desired to have it make, surely the Socialists' platform would have better served both the cause of peace and their own cause, and still have voiced the opinions of the great bulk of the Party membership on the War, by proceeding in some such language as this:—

“In none of the belligerent countries, nor in the United States, is the Government devoted to the welfare and happiness of the masses. Rather, the national life of all countries under the capitalist system is so organized as to shower wealth upon the few, while the many receive merely the minimum necessary to keep them at their task of manufacturing the wealth of which they obtain but a proportion. So far as the welfare of the masses is concerned, therefore, they are but little affected by what flag flies over their heads while they are exploited. The capitalist class of another country is no more the enemy of the workers than the capitalist class of their own country—even if Germany should impose its rule upon the entire world, the workers of the several countries would merely be exploited by the capitalists of Germany instead of by their own capitalists. However strong a hold national allegiance may still enjoy upon the hearts of the people, modern industrial, commercial and financial extension has nullified the true significance of national boundaries. The only war which can repay the untold life, wealth, misery and sacrifice which are spent on it would be a war

prosecuted for the purpose of distributing happiness equitably, if not equally.

“The present war is not such a war. Whichever group of belligerents wins, and whichever loses, it will be merely one branch of the capitalist system which wins and a similar branch of the capitalist system which loses. The only truly significant war is the struggle to abolish the capitalist system, and that struggle is only interrupted, if, indeed, not seriously postponed and weakened, by the present struggle between artificial issues. The world issue of the present and future is social and industrial democracy, just as the world-issue of the immediate past has been political democracy. Hence the future, looking back upon any war of today which is not waged for social and industrial democracy, will regard it as pathetically futile, just as the nineteenth century regarded a war between two groups of mediæval principalities both of which were groping in the darkness of the mediæval system.

“It is maintained, however, that though economic democracy and social democracy are not at stake in this war, the principle of political democracy is so at stake. It is maintained that economic democracy and social democracy are available only through political democracy, and that the goal of Socialism will be brought nearer by the victory of political democracy in this war, and will be ban-

ished to a greater distance by the victory of political autocracy.

“In reply to this contention, the Socialist Party must insist that the issue of political democracy in the present war is sadly obscured. France, Great Britain and Italy, it is true, have sloughed off the antiquated governmental absolutism which still rules Germany, Austria-Hungary and Turkey; but even the German system of Government is not so antiquated in its absolutism as is that of Japan, one of the Entente. And more and more the Far East is becoming the center of the world-stage. The Balkans also are near the center of the world-stage on which the curtain of the present war was raised; and the most democratic nation of the Balkans fights by the side of the Central Powers while the least democratic ranges with the Entente. Even the German system of government is not so autocratic and so inimical to progress as was that of Tsarist Russia; and when Ambassador von Bernstorff was dismissed, and war thus practically declared on Germany by the United States, the Tsar was still upon his throne. For more than two and a half years, the opponents of Germany were glad to have Tsarism as their ally. It is thus only an accident that the success of the United States in a war to defeat Kaiserism will not result also in the enhancement of Tsarism. A war which became a war of political principle only several

weeks ago through the chance of a revolutionary coup d'état might readily again become in a few weeks a war of no principle through the accident of a Tsarist coup d'état.

“The Socialist Party may be told, however, that the tree must be judged by its fruit; and that the capitalist system which is Germany is proved infinitely more evil than the French, British and Italian capitalist systems by the German violation of a solemn international pledge in the invasion of Belgium, as well as by the German treatment of Belgian civilians. The Socialist Party takes this occasion firmly to condemn the German invasion of Belgium as infamous, and its treatment of Belgian civilians as a reversion to barbarism. However, the Socialist Party must justify its position by calling attention to the fact that the present world war came but a hair's breadth from erupting in 1911, as a result of the 'Second Moroccan Affair.' This Moroccan crisis was brought to a head partly by the overbearing conduct of German diplomacy, but more largely by France's wanton violation of her solemn international pledges regarding Morocco, as defined in the international Algeciras Treaty of 1906 and later.

“The German treatment of Belgian civilians the Socialist Party takes this occasion to use as a text to illustrate its contention that the true enemy of the workers and of modern civilization is the capitalist system. Numerous vice investigations in

the great cities of the United States itself have discovered that hundreds of working-girls are driven into prostitution in our own country to an extent because of the low wages they receive. In spite of these findings, in but few instances has the country, through its national, state or municipal governments, provided such an easily available remedy as general minimum wage legislation. A country which will not pass laws to help keep many of its own working-women from resorting reluctantly to prostitution cannot cast a stone at even so brutal an outrage as the German treatment of Belgian civilians. Moreover, the cruelties inflicted by Germans on Belgians have by no means surpassed those inflicted by the Belgians themselves on the natives of the Congo, or by our own white citizens on our negro citizens in the South, while our local, state and national Governments officially refuse to interfere.

“In this connection, we call attention to the fact that it was not until the German Government again resorted to unrestricted submarine warfare that the present Administration was willing to lead this country into the War. Therefore, the United States enters the War, not because the war represents a struggle of right against wrong in which the right must triumph, but because this country's rights as a neutral have been violated. If war is declared upon Germany by the United States, the war will hence have as its main purpose avenge-

ment of violated American honor. It thus falls within the category of the duel; and the Socialist Party maintains that victory by means of armed might is no more successful a method of settling an international quarrel than the rapier thrust or the pistol shot at dawn was an adequate and justifiable method of settling a personal quarrel. We go on record as asserting that American rights and honor have been flagrantly abused by the German Government; and that all modern civilized standards of decency were outraged by the sinking of the *Lusitania*. We go on record as denouncing in the strongest terms of which we are capable the violation of international law by the German Government. We go on record as admitting that, according to the conceptions of the past underlying the old relations between nations, America has a just grievance against Germany. But, as the party entrusted with the conceptions of the future which will underlie the new relations of all classes of mankind, we must deny that an insult to national honor and to national rights justifies the untold expenditure of life, suffering and wealth demanded in the process of avenging the insult by means of war.

“The Socialist Party, however, is not so blinded to the character of the belligerents in the present War as not to appreciate that, on the whole, Germany represents a somewhat more vicious type of capitalism than Great Britain, France, Italy or

the United States. Insisting that Prussianism is inherent in all capitalist nations, and that the Huns are by no means all in Prussia, we yet realize that Prussianism has a stronger hold upon Germany than upon the Entente countries and the United States, and that in those lands the percentage of Huns is somewhat lower than in Prussia. If our country should unhappily be drawn into war against Germany, and if that war should nevertheless unhappily be dragged out until one camp is victorious and the other is vanquished, we go on record as believing that the progress of the world will be less seriously set back by the victory of the United States and its associates against Germany.

“Nevertheless, we are impelled to take an anti-war position because of our conviction that the present civilization represented by the United States as by all the other Great Powers is inherently a vicious, antiquated and backward-looking civilization. As Socialists, we obviously cannot support a war which, if successful, thus will result merely in the ascendancy of, let us say, an 80% vicious type of civilization over a 90% vicious type. The cost is too extravagantly high for the slight value of the achievement. When the present war is over, the struggle of Socialism to unseat Capitalism will face well-nigh the same opposition from a victorious Entente as from victorious Central Powers. For these reasons, as Socialists we pledge ourselves to, and concentrate all our

efforts on, preventing the entrance of the United States into the War. And if unsuccessful, we pledge ourselves at all times to exert all legal efforts in behalf of an immediate peace through the cessation of hostilities.

“Moreover, even to those who believe, as we cannot, that a difference of a truly fundamental nature exists between the civilization of one group of belligerents and that of the other, we solemnly point out the degrading effect of war. War is a direct and devastating enemy of the beneficent features of national life. It is similarly a direct and luxurious encouragement to malevolent forces undermining a nation’s democracy. The nation which wades through months and years of war emerges with an aggravated materialism and a new impatience of any considerations except those of might and force. War necessarily brings into play dormant brutal and savage instincts; and largely inhibits, even to the point of atrophy, the instincts which are the more generous and ennobling. Whatever differences may have existed between the Entente Allies’ civilization and Germany’s civilization before the War, to the disfavor of Germany, will be practically wiped out by the processes of war.

“Nor can the United States hope to escape this morally enervating effect of War, should she enter the lists against Germany. To whatever extent the capitalist system of Germany before 1914 was

more vicious than that of the other great Powers, it was so largely because Germany in time of peace was permeated by the spirit of war. The opponents of Germany may defeat her armed might on the battle-field; but in the course of the process, the spirit of Germany will have permeated them, and will have removed most of the points differentiating them from her. Our determination to oppose war by the United States against Germany thus functions for the preservation of whatever is wholesome in American civilization, and against the malevolent forces which would lower the plane of our national life.

“This being the position of the Socialist Party of America, what course of action can it and must it take in support of that position?

“In determining its course of action, the Socialist Party recognizes that it is but a minority party. As a minority, and as a political party pledged to abide by the decision and will of the majority, it must accept the decision and will of the majority if the majority determine upon war. But with all its power, the Socialist Party demands that action be taken to determine the will of the majority by means of an advisory referendum in which women as well as men shall vote. Only thus can both the proponents and the opponents of an American declaration of war upon Germany know whether the people of the country are in favor of war. In such a referendum, the Social-

ist Party, in conformity with its principles above set forth, naturally will exert all its power to obtain a decision for peace.

“In case such a referendum should return a decision for war, the Socialist Party in its actions must consider itself bound to accept that decision of the majority, no matter how firmly convinced that such a decision will redound to the injury of the country and of the world. It is in duty bound, therefore, not to resort to active, violent, illegal or extra-political methods in order to prevent the majority from prosecuting the war, or in order to effect peace. On the other hand, we remind our pro-war opponents that if we respect their rights as a majority, they are in duty bound to respect our privileges as a minority. Even if the country decides upon war, we preserve our right of free speech, of free press, of assemblage and of peaceful petition for a reversal of the war decision. In pursuance of this right as a political minority, and in accordance with our position as Socialists in opposition to this war and to the participation of our country in it, we pledge ourselves to agitate ceaselessly, through the constitutional methods open to a minority political party, for the immediate advent of peace.

“This demand for an advisory referendum on America’s participation in the War may be denied, and America may declare war by vote of Congress without any opportunity for the masses of the peo-

ple to make their voice heard. In that case, we still are pledged as a minority political party to abide by a decision adverse to us. By having organized politically in the past, we have accepted the method of government prevailing in this country, no matter how imperfect it may be. Also, we recognize that a minority political party cannot expect to enjoy all the freedom of dissent in time of war to which it is entitled in time of peace. To an extent, the exigencies of war justify the curtailment of certain superficial rights; and of course, military and naval information of value to the enemy cannot be allowed public discussion. But the fundamental rights of dissent belong to a minority even in war. The existence of war cannot provide any legitimate excuse for the majority to break its tacit contract with the minority which is implied in the practise of political democracy, any more than for the minority to break its contract with the majority; and the Socialist Party will carry out faithfully its end of the contract so long as its opponents carry out their end. There must be no suppression of Socialist newspapers and magazines; no interference with Socialist meetings; no ban upon Socialist campaigns in elections; no imprisonment of Socialist leaders merely for expressing anti-war views. In war as in peace, the presence of a militant opposition party is necessary to keep the ruling group from error, and from betrayal of the trust which has been reposed

in it. If the United States should enter the war against Germany, it will be of service rather than of injury to the country if the Socialist Party continues its opposition to the war, and thus compels those responsible for the conduct of the war to wage it for the high purposes which they have professed, and doubtless will continue to profess.

“Thus opposing American participation in the war, the Socialist Party nevertheless lays one solemn injunction upon those who differ with it and who support war participation. It is that possible American participation shall be used only to prevent German success and to ensure a peace without victory. The Socialist Party demands that the President of the United States keep ever before him and before the country his statements of January, 1917, that only a peace without victory can be a stable peace, and that a peace between victor and vanquished can only sow the seeds of future wars. If that was true while the United States was a neutral, it will be no less true if the United States become a belligerent.

“With respect to conscription and war loans, the Socialist Party must continue its attitude as the anti-war opposition party. We pledge our utmost to resist the enactment of conscription legislation. If conscription comes, we shall abide by the laws, and the attitude of each Socialist toward compulsory military service becomes then an individual matter. To every Socialist, as to any non-

Socialist, who feels called upon to deny the right of the state to conscript the individual for the business of killing, against the dictates of his own conscience and his own reason, we pledge our heartiest support; but the Socialist Party as such will not urge its individual members either to resist or to yield to conscription. Similarly, we demand that the war be paid for as it progresses, and that surplus wealth be taxed to the vanishing point before necessities are taxed, and before the Government incurs debt to pay for the war by means of war loans. If such loans are nevertheless passed, the Socialist Party can neither endorse nor oppose popular participation in them.

“As the political representative of the class-conscious workers of the United States, the Socialist Party of America once more reaffirms its allegiance to the principles of international Socialism. It still places international before national welfare. It still affirms that the true enemy of mankind and the true bar to mankind’s progress is the capitalist system. It renews its affiliations with the working-class movements and parties of other countries. It takes its stand by the side of these parties in all countries, Entente, Central Powers or neutral, which are opposing the continuation of the war; and it pledges to those parties its active cooperation in effecting an immediate peace.”

CHAPTER VI.

SOCIALISM AND THE ETHICAL APPEAL.

IF the foregoing considerations concerning the weakness of Socialism in the United States are substantially valid, the American Socialist movement will do well to launch its appeal from a new basis. The old appeal based largely on self-interest has proved too inadequate; for, as previously suggested, it may well be doubted if the majority of Americans at the present time belong to the proletariat in the Marxian sense of the term. Certainly, the doubt becomes stronger as to whether three-fourths of the people of the United States would gather round the Socialist flag even if they could be induced to obey the slogan, "Stick to your own class, work with it, vote for it." And by the constitutional obstacles to innovations in government in this country, it is probable that the Socialist Party could not succeed in realizing its program through political action unless it were supported by electorates in three-fourths of the states. This is especially true because of the fact that in national elections both the old parties will indisputably coalesce against the Socialist Party

when it becomes powerful, as they have already coalesced against it in Congressional and local elections where it has threatened their supremacy; and will thus remove the possibility of playing off one old party against the other, in the method of campaign employed, for instance, to effect prohibition.

And unless the farmers are brought into the fold, success for political-action Socialism in the United States may again well be despaired of. The number of farmers in the United States may be steadily decreasing in proportion to the population, and the number of farm tenants steadily increasing, but there are few indications that in the immediate future the number of farmers will fall below 25% of the total number of workers. (About 36% of the employed males in the United States were listed by the 1910 census as in agricultural and kindred pursuits.) Even if the number should fall to 20%, when it came to rounding up the three-fourths of the states necessary for constitutional amendments, the Socialist Party would probably find that in more than one-fourth of the states the farmers would be sufficiently near 50%, especially when reinforced by the members of the capitalist and middle classes and by others outside of the benefits to be conferred by Socialism, to put a spoke in the Socialist wheel.

It seems obvious, therefore, that unless the Socialist Party is willing to remain a minority party

of protest and stimulation, furnishing to its members only the emotional thrill and intellectual satisfaction of being in open rebellion against the established order of things, and to its opposing capitalist parties new ideas and a goad to progress; or else unless it is willing to abandon its status as an organization of political action, it will have to enlarge its program so as to provide for the interests of the agricultural population, both individual landowner and tenant farmer. To do so, it will be compelled to do more than throw a few sops to Agriculture in the way of planks for state-owned grain elevators and state marketing machinery, as the more recent programs of the Socialist Party have done. Indeed, the Socialist programs will have to go farther than even give extended attention to the farmers' needs. They will have to place the farmers' welfare on a plane of at least equal importance with the welfare of Labor, and will have to devote at least as much attention to solving the ills of agriculture as to solving those of industry. Otherwise, there will be no reason why the farmer who becomes dissatisfied with the present economic system should turn to the Socialist Party instead of to the Non-Partisan League, for instance; or why the Non-Partisan League should join forces with the Socialist Party.

But so long as the Socialist Party appeals for membership and political support solely or chiefly

on the self-interest appeal, the farmers will remain religiously aloof. It is true that the 1920 Census shows that the proportionate number of farms in the United States is growing smaller. The day may even arrive when the ownership of agricultural land will become as concentrated as the ownership of industries; when the small farm owned and worked by the individual will become so rare as the small business owned and worked by the individual; when the economies of large-scale production will prove applicable to agriculture as well as to industry; when hence there will arise large agricultural corporations, which will produce the bulk of the farm products of the country, which will be owned by stockholders scattered over all parts of the nation, and which will employ thousands of men who will own no part of the land they work, receiving money instead of produce as the result of their toil. But, unless all indications lie, that day belongs to a period too distant to enter into the calculations of Socialist procedure in the immediate future. At the present time, it is far from the farmer's self-interest to join a movement aiming generally at Government ownership and operation, as distinct from general private ownership and operation.

True, the Socialist Party may assure the farmer that for the present the Socialist program will not be applied to land worked by its owner, so that at least it will not be to the farmer's injury if Social-

ism becomes dominant. But neither will the dominance of Socialism redound appreciably to his benefit on the present appeal to self-interest. It might redound slightly to his benefit by cheapening agricultural implements, seed, fertilizer, clothing, agricultural credit and mortgages, marketing processes. But to bring him along on that reckoning, the Socialist Party would have to launch its appeal from the basis of the greater material efficiency of a Socialist system; and, as we have seen, the Socialist Party seldom takes that tack. Furthermore, if Agriculture be corralled by proof of greater material efficiency, Labor will have to be similarly corralled; obviously, a Socialist movement cannot progress by holding self-interest before the wage-earners who support it and greater material efficiency before the farmers who support it. In the last analysis, greater economic efficiency and economic self-interest may be almost identical as bases of appeal; but at present the Socialist appeal asserts self-interest chiefly through more efficient distribution of wealth, instead of through more efficient production of wealth. Even so, the benefit to be derived by the farmer from such items as the cheapening of the tools and the fertilizer he uses is probably insufficient to overcome his natural and acquired inertia and hostility to Socialism to the point where he will support the Socialist program.

In suggesting that the Socialist movement pre-

sent its appeal largely on an ethical basis, I fully appreciate that in the present year of our Lord the word "ethical" has a most unfortunate connotation. It suggests the Epworth League, the Chautauqua platform, the social problem novel and Woodrow Wilson. What I mean by the ethical impulses on which the Socialist movement ought chiefly to rely is the impulses in man which tempt him to work for the common good, often when he himself will not thereby be benefited, and occasionally when he himself may even thereby be injured. That such altruistic impulses are present in man as well as selfish impulses, it seems hard to deny. The instances are too many, spring too readily to the mind, occur too frequently in one's every-day experiences as well as in history, are too convincing. True, they may be and doubtless should be traced back to non-altruistic factors, and I am particularly fearful lest the use of the word "ethical" should imply a belief that the "ethical" impulses in man derive from some supernatural source. The anthropologist may give us their origin in the tribal instinct developed in the prehistoric days when inability or failure to place the survival or success of the tribe above the individual's selfish instincts proved fatal not only to the tribe, but also to the non-altruistic individual. Or the psychologist may find the origin of the ethical impulses in the instinct for commendation of one's fellows, in a sublimation of the sex

instinct, in development of the paternal instinct, in a slight twitching of a minor abdominal muscle, or in similar sources. The birth and nurture of the ethical impulse do not concern us here. I am pointing only to the fact that it exists, may be appealed to, may be built upon.

The Marxian may deny that this ethical impulse is ever strong enough to counterbalance the appeal of self-interest, except in rare instances and in rare individuals. But surely the very existence and procedure of the Socialist movement in the United States refute him. The Socialist Party of America contains a large number of members who belong to it and strive for it solely because of their belief in its principles, and who have nothing to gain by their Socialist adherence and striving. Indeed, it contains many who have lost jobs, higher salaries, social prestige, to say nothing of leisure and recreation, because of their Socialist activities; and who held no illusion that Socialism would arrive in time to benefit them, or would benefit them if it did arrive. The regular attendance upon drab and dreary Local and committee meetings, the early rising on Sunday mornings and the late retiring on week-day nights in order to distribute literature, the persistent street-corner harangues before apathetic or hostile audiences, to say nothing of ten, fifteen and twenty year jail sentences, surely these evidences of devotion which alone have held the Socialist Party

together cannot be explained solely on the basis of self-interest. And if the Marxian retort that these instances are exceptional, one can point to the stand of the Socialist Party as a whole on American participation in the World War. It must have been apparent to the leaders and rank-and-file of the Socialist Party that the adoption of the St. Louis Resolution would injure the organization—perhaps at the very outset of American participation giving it renewed strength from the support of pacifists and pro-Germans, but as the war continued, covering it with general disapprobation and hostility. Indeed, probably only a few of the more cool-headed leaders and rank-and-file members paid any heed to the effect of the St. Louis Resolution in advancing the self-interest of the Socialist Party; they voted for it because of the ethical impulse to have the Party take the stand on war which it seemed to them the Party was ethically obligated to take.

However, even granting that the ethical impulse cannot generally be appealed to, in opposition to self-interest, to gain general support for the Socialist cause, surely the Marxian will grant that the ethical appeal may succeed where it is not opposed to self-interest. He will doubtless grant even that in such case its use is justifiable and may be wholesome, or, at least, not unwholesome. Now, in the present stage of development of the American capitalist system, there are still great num-

bers of people whose self-interest is but little bound up, for better or for worse, in the advent of Socialism. They are not only members of the middle-class, whose salaries would probably be cut in about the same proportion as their expenses by the substitution of Socialism for capitalism, and whose mode of life would accordingly probably be but little changed. They are also, and more particularly, as just maintained, the farmers. The farmers are peculiarly susceptible to the ethical appeal. Religion has a stronger hold upon them than upon most of the other elements of the community, and they respond more readily than probably any other element to appeals for support of a movement because it is "right" and in furtherance of the ethical principles of Christianity.

As a matter of fact, there is at the present time in the United States an inchoate sympathy with socialism—not with Socialism. To an extent, of course, this sympathy is due to resentment at profiteering; discomfort from the high cost of living; anger at the ruthless suppression of minority opinion inflicted during and after our participation in the World War; possibly stirring of the imagination by the success of Soviet Russia against the capitalistic nations' attacks upon her; and, within intellectual circles, sad disillusion as to the ability of a mere liberalism to be effective in the present intensity of post-war hysteria and economic class warfare. But that sympathy is due also to a vague

realization that the *motif* of the capitalist system contradicts the ethical principles that we avow, whether in churches, in silent communion of prayer, in literature or elsewhere. This sympathy is evidenced by an increasing number of admissions that "Oh, yes, there are many good points about Socialism"; "I'm a Socialist in lots of things"; "I suppose Socialism is bound to come."

Of course, this frame of mind is largely unorganized and unconscious of the true import of Socialism. What it purports, rather, is an increasing longing for a system of human relations that will be more kindly and generally "different," without any very definite program for the consummation of this ethical impulse. But the significant point, it seems to me, is that when persons of this frame of mind come into actual contact with the Socialist movement, many are apt to be repelled, rather than attracted. The compleat Marxian, of course, would explain this repulsion by self-interest: the vague sympathizer with Socialism as holding forth a promise of a more Christian civilization loses his sympathy when he realizes that Socialism will endanger the fatness of his purse. But many who are thus repelled are those whose pocketbooks will be fattened, or at least unaffected, by the advent of Socialism. Or else they are, in some cases, of those who in the past have proved superior to the self-interest consideration by supporting other movements which have threat-

ened their purses, or which occasionally, becoming successful, have carried the threat to fulfillment. And when such persons get on the inside of the Socialist movement, they cannot but feel stifled at the intolerance and suppression inherent in its machinery. Socialist Party members who, even at the dictates of their consciences and in almost unparalleled crises, should vote for a candidate other than the regular Party candidate, are automatically subject to expulsion. The rule is as inflexible when the vote was cast for a President in the hope that he would keep the country out of war as if the vote were to be cast for a physician of rare administrative ability as health commissioner of a large city, rather than for the Socialist candidate who might or might not be able to handle the municipal health problems in the face of an impending plague or epidemic. There are other similar rules the infraction of which also renders the Comrade automatically subject to expulsion. The Socialist Party, bitterly complaining when, as a sincere minority party in the United States, it is treated with intolerance, displays much intolerance toward any minority opinion which might sincerely arise within its own ranks.

Moreover, such potential sympathizers with Socialism are particularly repelled, in many cases, by the flatly sordid demand which underlies much of the current Socialist propaganda in the United States:—"The workman must receive the full re-

turn of his labor." They thus discover that, in the words they themselves would probably use, "These Socialists are afraid that they aren't getting all that's coming to them." They can understand, of course, this point of view—it is the point of view of most other organized groups in the community, and it may be justified. But many who have been vaguely stirred by the promise of a "better" type of civilization turn away feeling that, after all, "The Socialists are just like the rest of them." In the battle-cry, "The worker must receive all he produces," there is little to capture the imagination of those who, like the farmers, have little direct interest in such a slogan, but who are responsive to ethical issues. At all events, I believe most Socialists themselves would agree that the sympathy with socialism with a small "s" in the United States is greater than the sympathy with or support of Socialism with capital "S," and that that state of affairs can be only partially explained by the effect of anti-Socialist propaganda.

After all, the evils which Socialism attacks are largely the evils against which the ethical principles of Christianity are arrayed, and the benefits which Socialism would bestow are largely the benefits which would accrue by adherence to the ethical principles to which Christendom pays at least nominal homage. This statement naturally does not imply any belief that Jesus was

a Socialist more than eighteen hundred years before Marx, or that Jesus's system can in any sense be described as Socialism. Still less does it imply, in making use of ethics on which Christian civilization is founded, or on which a Christian civilization would be founded, a willingness to accept, or even to connive at, the theology which has grown up around those ethics. This is, rather, simply another way of saying that when Socialism abandons its "inevitability" line of approach in favor of an "ought" line of approach, the "ought" becomes meaningless unless the ethics of Christianity are accepted. It is on these ethics that the Socialist must base his "ought"; if those ethics are rejected, the anti-Socialist merely retorts "'Ought?' Why 'ought?'" and is unanswerable.

Why, then, should not the Socialist movement present its appeal largely on the ground that the present capitalist system of Christendom is a frank and flagrant denial of the ethical principles which Christendom professes; and that a Socialist system, on the whole, represents the crystallization of those principles, as tempered by the twentieth century's need for organization and integration which must render impracticable much of the individualist communism and anarchism which Jesus taught? These ethical principles are in existence; are accepted theoretically by most persons; are mighty in their power; and clamor to be

used in political and economic campaigns and struggles. Of course, it is easy to wax clever at the expense of the Christian ethical system—not merely in its present application, or lack of application; but also, if strictly applied, in its inadequacy and vagueness in meeting the complex problems of modern life. And yet, away from the intellectual circles, there would probably be nothing to replace the Christian principles, or at least nothing so wholesome, if they should be abandoned. For most people, after all, nothing else preaches so adequately the need for the elementary virtues, and it would be a serious calamity if those principles should still further atrophy through disuse.

It may be objected that it is exaggeration to maintain that the Socialist movement in the United States is not based upon ethical considerations and ignores ethical values in presenting its case. True, there is naturally a proportion of Socialist propaganda which may be called ethical, just as there is a proportion of the Socialist Party membership which visualizes Socialism fundamentally as the fulfillment of the commonly-accepted moral code. And yet, on the whole, a Socialist who would like to see American Socialism lay more stress upon the ethical appeal is apt to find in the Socialist movement too much reliance upon the idea of physical force. He is apt to feel that the working-class is urged to hurl

the capitalist class from the seat of power, and jump into the saddle itself, too little because it ought to be in the saddle; and too much because, if it so wills, it has the might to sit there. He would find this point of view too often, for instance, in Socialist reaction to current industrial struggles. He would find too many Socialists who will support every strike, whether justified or unjustified—indeed, too many who are prone to deny that the workers can ever be unjustified in striking.

Now, all strikes can be supported as part of the general struggle between the capitalist class and the proletariat, in which the proletariat on the whole has the better case and should win, and in which general support of the proletariat therefore involves support of all its skirmishes. Just so, a pro-Entente sympathizer during the World War might have stuck to his side despite the violation of the neutrality of Greece and the theft of German private property in the United States. But such a pro-Entente sympathizer must still have characterized the violation of Grecian neutrality and the German private property robbery as ethically wrong, regretting that they had to be supported if the entire Entente cause was to be supported. Whereas your American Socialist too often supports even strikes in direct violation of contracts, not regretfully, not because only thus can he support the general class struggle, but joyously, be-

cause in his eyes almost any means to raise the proletariat and lower the bourgeoisie is justified.

Again, it is naturally possible to defend strikes in violation of contracts on the ground that such contracts, if inelastic, if manipulated by union officials against the will of the rank and file, if covering too long a period of time, are in themselves unethical and unjustified. But, again, that is seldom the Socialist position in the case of strikes involving a breach of contract on the part of the workers any more than in those involving a breach of contract on the part of the employers. I have seen a copy of what might be called the most representative Socialist publication in the United States appearing in large type under this motto:—"The Working-Class Is Always Right." Surely, that sentiment is evidenced by the fact that the journal in question frequently distorts news of strikes to favor the workers almost as violently as capitalist newspapers distort it to favor the employers. If 50,000 workers go out on strike in New York City, one can generally be as sure that the *Call* will announce that 100,000 have struck as that the *Times* will announce that 25,000 have struck. If the strikers are losing their struggle, the Socialist press can usually be relied upon to conceal the fact at least as faithfully as the capitalist press can be relied upon to conceal a strikers' victory. It is too much the unethical creed that against the foe all means are justified,

the creed which dictated the German invasion of Belgium, the Allied conduct of the War, once it was begun, and the terms of peace which tried to crystallize the victory when it had been achieved. And if the Socialist movement pursues its struggle against the capitalist system thoroughly under the sway of such a creed, the organization of the victory will be along lines similar to those of the Treaty of Versailles, as unstable, and as surely calculated to make the effort and the victory not only useless, but even worse than useless.

Of course, there are many Socialists who believe that the ethical principles which claim mankind's theoretical allegiance are not wholesome, and that the use of them is hence not wholesome. And yet this very type of Socialist is apt to make use of these ethical principles, and thus also to render theoretical allegiance to them. He is a rare Socialist, indeed, who does not arraign the capitalist class and the capitalist leaders for disregarding ethics by imprisoning prominent Socialists, by disorganizing Socialist meetings, by expelling Socialist representatives and assemblymen elected to office, by suppressing Socialist newspapers, by keeping I. W. W. in jail without bail and almost without charges, by poisoning the sources of public opinion and by utilizing thugs and religious prejudices to break strikes. Certainly, it will be difficult to find a Socialist palliation of these unethical acts of the capitalist class on the ground that these acts

are but in conformity with the principle of self-interest. Under these circumstances, it would seem as though the Socialists might be willing to leave the question of the value of the ethical principles open, as more than twenty-five hundred years of fervent discussion have left it open; and to use them to further the cause, if they will further it. And finally, even the Socialist who is an out-and-out materialist can hardly object to using ethical principles, even those in which he disbelieves, to attain his ends, for he naturally will not object to the principle and practise of "The ends justify the means."

(In passing, it may be noted that if the Socialist movement should succeed in identifying itself in the minds of the electorate with the electorate's present current and accepted ethics, and if the electorate should nevertheless still reject Socialism, the result would be to end much of the people's theoretical allegiance to principles which they either cannot or will not live up to—and there are few consummations more devoutly to be desired than that.)

For example, consider the Socialist appeal based on the class struggle. The class struggle is probably the least vulnerable of the doctrines invoked by Marx. Acceptance of it must be qualified less seriously than even acceptance of the economic interpretation of history. Many of the keenest students of modern social and political

movements who have felt themselves unable to accept either Marxian Socialism or Revisionist Socialism are willing to accept most of the doctrine of the class struggle. The Socialist program calls theoretically not only for a recognition of the class struggle, but also for its abolition by what Socialism conceives to be the only possible method. Socialism maintains that the abolition of the class struggle can come only through the abolition of the present class division by the incorporation of all members of society into one class, the class of the workers. (Under Socialism, of course, the owning class would be replaced in this process by the Government, synonymous with all the people, that is, with the workers; or else, under the latter-day influence of the syndicalist and guild socialist urge, by individual groups of the workers, who thus become both workers in and owners of the establishments to which their labor is devoted.)

Now, the public mind in the United States at the present time is seriously perturbed at manifestations of the class struggle which have forged to the fore, especially since November 11, 1918. The American public is more than discommoded at the incidence of strikes. It is developing anxiety concerning the danger that the entire fabric of American political institutions may be rent in twain by the intensity of the economic conflict; and it is sincerely eager to find a method of ending the class struggle. If the Socialist appeal would stress ade-

quately the value of the Socialist system, and the futility of any other prescription, in abolishing the economic class struggle by abolishing the economic class-division, the American public would react much more favorably than it does now to the Socialist appeal. Naturally, this statement does not imply that the appeal to terminate the class struggle by abolishing the owner class would find ready listeners among all or most of that class; but it does imply that it would find ready listeners among most of those whose status is not overwhelmingly owner status, and even among a considerable number of those, including the farmers, whose status is the owner status.

But in the face of this feeling in the United States, ready to be exploited and holding out rich promise to those who will exploit it, the Socialist Party of America concentrates too much of its fire on the evil and too little on the cure. There is much preaching of class consciousness in order to end the class struggle, but there is also too much preaching of the class struggle *qua* class struggle and too much recognition of class consciousness *qua* class consciousness. True, in the books and more formal Socialist documents and addresses the blessings of ending the class struggle are stressed; but to one who believes that the American Socialist movement has much to gain by emphasizing the ethical import of Socialism, it must appear that much of the Socialist propa-

ganda which actually penetrates the American consciousness rejoices in, rather than deplotes, the class war.

The charge that Socialism preaches class hatred is based on a fallacy so transparent that by this time it must arise from sheer misrepresentation rather than from mere ignorance. It is the present alignment of society largely into the group of the owners and the group of the workers which gives rise to the class struggle and hence causes class hatred. But, nevertheless, the Socialist movement in this country has provided too much excuse for observers of it to conclude that it assails the capitalist class, not merely in order to render the capitalist class powerless to thwart the fruition of the Cooperative Commonwealth, but also through sheer hatred of it; not merely in order to soften the world's old misery, but also to give the capitalist class a taste of misery new to it. Those seeking surcease from the spirit of hatred dominating the world today turn naturally to the Socialist movement, and they will be repelled by evidence that it, too, lies in the grip of war-psychology. For it is more than a question of tactics—it is a question of a frame of mind. Such a war-psychology inevitably develops the frame of mind of those who professed that the United States must defeat Germany in order that a better world-system might replace the Balance of Power; but who in reality rather were actuated by the longing to

“lick the Huns good and proper.” And a Socialist may be pardoned for fearing that this frame of mind in waging a class struggle would render the results of the victory as barren and dangerous as it rendered the results of the victory in the struggle between the capitalist nations.

This failure of the Socialist movement to stress the virtues of Socialism in abolishing the present class division has become all the more serious since August 1, 1914. For, as the pacifists predicted, the processes of War have intensified nationalism so extravagantly as to render more difficult than ever any organization of the world on the basis of an internationalism to which nationalism will be and must be subordinate. But, as many of the pacifists did not understand, the feeling for nationalism is more than an artificially-created allegiance inculcated by non-Christian and militaristic education. It is a mighty manifestation of man's clannish craving, of loyalty to his group as against other groups; and doubtless it is the inevitable heritage of man's long history in tribal groups as he groped toward development somewhat higher than that of his fellow-animals. It has become well-nigh an emotional necessity, this patriotism; and hence it cannot be nullified by a mere intellectual demonstration of either its futility or its viciousness. Or, at least, it can be so nullified only in the case of those who have severely trained their emotions to be subordinate to their intellects;

and at the present development of the race, such persons are an impotent handful, if, indeed, they will ever cease being in the decided minority.

If the evils of nationalism as opposed to internationalism and of loyalty to the group as opposed to loyalty to the whole are ever to be controlled, it will have to be by opposing to them a system based also on man's craving for clannishness. And this the Socialist preachment of the international class struggle could do. By lining up the working-class of all countries against the common enemy, the capitalist system (or, if necessary, the capitalist class), it furnishes as a substitute for nationalism an internationalism which makes the same appeal to man's clannish instinct as nationalism makes. Of course, the corraling of the world's working-class into one group for the purposes of action, together with those not primarily of the working-class who are attracted by the ethical appeal of such a program, will probably prove far more difficult than it has proved in the past to corral all economic classes into effective geographical national groups. Differences such as those of language and religion are serious obstacles to such an effective internationalism. Furthermore, however weak the feeling for nationalism may have been at the beginning of the nineteenth century, it works most potently upon mankind in this third decade of the twentieth century. It has become surrounded with a halo of

tradition and authority which has given it an ethical, or even religious, hold upon men. For that reason, it can be supplanted by an international alignment along class lines only if that alignment is preached, not primarily as a scientific or a determinist development, but primarily as an emotional summons to an ethical, or even to a religious, crusade.

And even if the international class struggle should be sincerely waged as an ethical crusade, its results, if successful in achieving the purpose for which it was waged, also will have to be surrounded with an ethical, even a religious authority. Man is a worshipping animal. To assure preservation of the wholesome institutions which he has achieved, he must be allowed or induced to conceive them as worthy of veneration. Of course, in the face of a crisis like war, even the worship will not save the institution, any more than it saved freedom of speech and press in the United States during the war against Germany; but when the crisis is over, the worship paid the institution will help to restore it, as our holding of freedom of speech and press as a fetish in the pre-war days has been largely responsible for the opposition against continuing the more drastic sections of the Espionage Act after the war.

Naturally, there is a grave danger in thus surrounding an institution or a movement with a pseudo-religious authority. The danger is that

the institution or movement is rendered impervious to change, and becomes an Old Man of the Sea on the back of progress, as the Constitution of the United States has become. Therefore, along with this raising of the institution or movement to a pedestal must proceed the leadership that will stimulate a people or the international grouping of all peoples to empirical criticism and experiment. This balancing between the two tendencies, inevitably, will be no easy matter; but whether under internationalism or under nationalism, the truly wise statesmanship of the future, as of the past, will strengthen the veneration in which the wholesome heritage from the past is held, at the same time that it undermines the veneration in which the unwholesome heritage is held.

Also, even if the attempt at an international working-class alignment should be successful, it cannot expect to eliminate minor groupings and affiliations. The instincts of the herd which had previously resulted in particularist nationalism will not be satisfied with the universalism of even an effective internationalism. The nations will persist, if in emasculated power. The repression of man's clannish instinct thwarted by their emasculation will then probably result, in part, in an intensification of the present allegiances not affected by the advent of international Socialism in Europe and the Americas. Such will be the

religious and the fraternal allegiances. But with national boundaries made fainter, this thwarting of the clannish instinct should result also in beneficent new and mightier groupings and affiliations along natural instead of artificial lines, such as kinship of profession and similarity of intellectual interests.

This launching of the Socialist appeal primarily from an ethical basis, then, should help to obviate the danger that the advent of Socialism will provide merely an increase in material welfare, and stop there. Let the idealistic spirit of the pre-Marxian Socialism be revived, to be guided and rendered definite and practicable by the Marxian and post-Marxian study of organization. Let the Socialist movement identify its program, if only loosely, with the concrete exemplification of what may be called the Christian ethics and principles and ideals, putting them to the pragmatic test. Let the Socialist movement thus appeal primarily to the deep-lying right-and-wrong sentiment of the nation, not as propaganda and not in mere lip-homage, but as the guide to be meticulously followed in the organization of the Socialist state. There will be little danger that such an ethical enthusiasm appealed to intelligently, and in a spirit of tolerance, will be satisfied with the mere achievement of decent material comfort for all in the community, and

will not proceed to project itself, with material well-being as the necessary foundation, into well-nigh every field of human endeavor and every creation of the human spirit.

CHAPTER VII.

SOME CONSIDERATIONS CONCERNING SOCIALIST POLICY.

I THE Socialist movement in the United States has been ineffective in its appeal, not only because of the background from which that appeal has proceeded, but also because of its technique of campaign. Even if in the past the Socialist Party had been able to free itself from the deductive Marxian mold of thought and had launched its appeal largely from an ethical basis, in all probability it still would have been impotent because of faulty presentation of its case. And even if its case had been ably presented, and the Party ridden triumphantly to power, in all probability it would have been soon unseated had it not opened its eyes to certain features of its problem to which at the present time it seems to be blind. Without in any way attempting to formulate a detailed and final mode of procedure for the American Socialist movement, it may be of service to indicate certain pitfalls in its path which must be carefully avoided even when the path has been finally discovered and fairly entered upon.

A In the first place, the Socialist Party of America

seems to labor under appalling ignorance as to the nature of most Americans. The reasons are obvious. The Party membership is recruited largely from the foreign-born. It has been almost entirely industrial, and it does not understand the problems and the concepts of the great mass of Americans, even in the cities, who are not industrial workers. It also is predominantly urban, and does not appreciate the nature of the life and the people in the agricultural districts and in the small towns. The addresses and the literature which arouse enthusiasm in a New York East Side or in a Paterson or in a Milwaukee audience are apt to arouse only hostility in a Brooklyn or a Montclair or a Louisville or an Adams County, Ohio, audience. And when it comes to a show of hands at the polling-booths for or against Socialism, the country will go as go Brooklyn and Montclair and Louisville and Adams County.

Consider, for example, the prohibition agitation and the prevailing Socialist explanation of it. Here was a movement which in less than a generation swept across the country with irresistible force, which is now seen to have evidenced a sentiment well-nigh as unanimous as any sentiment which has left its mark upon the United States without artificial stimulation, and which placed upon the statute books in some respects the most radical and far-reaching single piece of legislation ever enacted in this country. Yet even when the

prohibition movement was on the brink of its final triumph, the Socialists, as a rule, were so unappreciative of the dominant American opinion on the drink problem as to ascribe Prohibition to a plot of the capitalists to lower wages, or to whatever other capitalistic plot happened to fit in with Marxian ideology. The leaders of the Republican and Democratic Parties, national or local, were by no means so undiscerning!

For another and perhaps more illuminating example, consider the conventional Socialist attitude toward the phenomenon known as Billy Sunday. The current and well-nigh unanimous Socialist diagnosis of Sunday was that he was the tool of the capitalist class in allaying discontent among the workers. Undoubtedly Sunday's work may have had that effect, among other effects, and undoubtedly much of the support, financial and personal, donated to the Sunday campaigns was donated with that ulterior purpose either consciously or unconsciously in mind. But to explain away the Sunday revivals solely or even chiefly in such terms was to reveal ignorance of the normal frame of mind of many Americans, which those revivals served to illuminate. Probably nothing would be of greater value to the Socialist movement than some development which would compel each of its leaders to spend six months in a town like Marion, Ohio, and the thousands of other communities where the type of

mind which shouts Amen to Billy Sunday theology is the dominant type of mind. Or else to pay weekly visits to the scattered farmhouses of Kansas and Georgia; for to judge by the Socialist campaigns of the past, the Socialist leaders appear ignorant that the average American farmer is hostile to "big business" at the same time that he is complacent towards or else uncomprehending of "capitalism." It is one of the encouraging features of the American Socialist movement in 1921 that the unpopularity and persecution visited on its head in the preceding four years should have partially awakened it to the mental reactions of most Americans—an awakening revealed by a moderation in the 1920 national Socialist platform as regards statement of principles and by the couching of its immediate program in phraseology and projects comprehensible to most voters.

Consider also the typical Socialist attitude toward the detention by the Wilson administration of the conscientious objectors. To most Socialists, Secretary of War Baker was abnormally remiss and hard-hearted in his treatment of them during the War, and in his refusal to release all of them immediately after the armistice. And yet the Wilson administration's treatment of the "C. O.s," bitterly denounced by most Socialists as too stringent, was far more tender than the treatment desired by most Americans. The handling of the objectors was one of the many reasons for the

Wilson administration's general unpopularity through the entire country during and after hostilities against Germany. Indeed, if aside from the treatment meted out to the "C. O.s," the Democratic Party had had an equal chance to defeat the Republicans in the 1920 elections, outcry against the "tenderness" shown the conscientious objectors would probably have been alone sufficient to turn the tide of battle against the Democrats. The American Legion's position on the subject is illuminating; not merely because the American Legion is politically powerful, but also because it is well representative of the ideas current in most Americans' minds. The Socialists' ignorance of the bitterness felt by most sections of public opinion towards the conscientious objectors is but another evidence of their ignorance of American public opinion generally.

B In the second place, the American Socialist movement errs flagrantly in both disregarding and misconceiving the rôle played by personalities in carrying a political movement to fruition by the processes of political democracy. The conventional Socialist appeal to the voters is—"Vote for a principle, not for a personality; follow a new philosophy, not an individual leader." But it may be seriously doubted if that appeal is practicable of pursuit by the great mass of the voters. The difficulty is probably an intellectual one. The majority of Americans, if not also the majority of

①

all the western European races, seem unable or unwilling to think in abstract terms. They must think and vote for the concrete, and the abstract principle and the new philosophy can present themselves to their minds only in the guise of a personality and an individual leader. Socialist exhorters may obtain a hearing to explain what Socialism is and at what it aims, but the great mass of the American people will form their judgment of Socialism by their judgment of the Socialist standard-bearers. Even the comparatively small proportion of the electorate which is reached by Socialist addresses and pamphlets is (2) prone to visualize the true character of Socialism by those Socialists most in the public eye today. When the Socialist Party arrives at a stage of strength when both the old parties concentrate their fire upon it, most of the electors, in their decision as to the contrast between the new system for which they are asked to vote and the old system under which they will be living, will be guided largely by the personal contrast between the exponents of the new system and the proponents of the old.

One of the reasons for the American Socialist movement's comparatively feeble hold upon the American people lies in the failure of its leaders (3) to impress the American people with a sense of nobility of character and fineness of purpose. The particular political and economic remedy offered

by Socialism for our present ills is not what is connoted to the average voter by the word "Socialism." It connotes to him, rather, a scheme or a hope for a generally nobler and finer civilization, different from our present civilization to a revolutionary degree. He therefore naturally, if illogically, expects the leaders of Socialism, or even the rank and file of Socialists, to be generally nobler and finer personal types, leading lives of purpose different to a revolutionary degree from the life's purposes of the hoi polloi. Thus I have met among the foreign-born in the congested districts of one of our great cities men who had been inspired by the example of Tolstoi; who were elevated by the very mention of his name or the sight of his picture; and who yet admitted that they had read none of his writings, and, indeed, had little knowledge as to just what sort of writings they were. It was the example of his personal career that had impressed them. In our own country, *si parva licet componere magnis*, the personal faith inspired in great masses of our humbler citizens by William Jennings Bryan may well have been one of the most valuable assets of the Democratic Party in the last several decades. Tolstoi was hopelessly visionary, of course, and Bryan's mind is inelastic; but the Socialist movement will hardly succeed without leaders who can inspire personal following as those men inspired it. Indeed, unless our present information is too

scanty for successful analysis, Socialism in Germany failed to keep in the saddle, after its unparalleled opportunity following the military defeat of Germany in the World War, very largely because there was no German Socialist leader or group of leaders who could arouse in the German people's breasts sufficient conviction of high nobility of character and fineness of purpose to lead to enthusiastic faith and confidence.

In some slight campaigning for Socialism in New York City, the greatest single stumbling-block I have encountered in the task of converting my audiences has been the fact that one of the most prominent Socialist leaders happens to be associated with a large retail coal monopoly in that city. It has proved of little avail to retort that the audience was being asked to vote for a principle, not for a personality; and that the desirability of Socialism was not to be confounded with the personal business relations of any individual Socialist. Of little more avail were the retorts that the gentleman in question was, after all, asking the electorate to vote him out of a job by removing the coal business from private into public hands; that he had waxed far less prosperous than if he had not devoted most of his life to the furtherance of Socialism, and comparatively little of it to the prosecution of his profession; that he had manifestly proved his sincerity by all but laying down his life for his cause; or even that it

was impossible to live according to Socialistic tenets under a capitalistic system. For even the few dollars that a conscientious Socialist might deposit in savings banks or invest in life insurance might well be used to buy houses from which high rentals would be charged working-class tenants. Despite all logical refutation, the fact alone was damning to an electorate which seems incurably disposed to think politically in terms of personality—and there was always the lurking suspicion that, after all, it might not be altogether unfair nor unwise to gauge a movement's fitness for confidence by its leaders' adherence to its tenets in their own lives.

For this reason, the personality of Eugene Victor Debs probably has been the most valuable single asset of the Socialist Party of America. (This statement is in no wise related to the wisdom or folly of nominating Debs for the Presidency while he was serving a jail sentence.) Were he still the Socialist Party's nominee for President, and still available for the office, when the Socialist Party might be seriously considered as a contender for the Presidency, the inherent nobility of his personality and of his career would rally more support to the Socialist ticket than would come from the nomination of a candidate who inspired more confidence as an administrator and as a thinker-through of problems, but less enthusiasm as a personality. To this, your orthodox

Socialist will, of course, reply indignantly that such support is worse than none at all, and that Socialism must not come until such day as the working-class has been educated to Socialism's significance. But it is supremely difficult to educate the working-class or any other class to the conception of a new state of society which has not yet been concretely realized. Their final education along these lines may well have to await the day when a Socialist administration begins to legislate the new state of society into concrete being, and when thus the people are shown the aims of Socialism in actuality.

It had become by 1921 a platitude to explain the British political situation by saying that Lloyd George was a splendid leader without a party, and that the British Labor Party was a splendid party without a leader. If even so well-organized and so discerning a radical political movement as the British Labor Party finds itself handicapped by the lack of a leader or leaders who can capture the popular imagination, how much more does the poorly organized and undiscerning American Socialist movement suffer from that lack! A single Socialist chieftain of the Roosevelt type, a powerful exhorter and yet an able administrator, would be the greatest of boons to the Socialist Party of America. Swept into office by even an electorate uneducated to class-consciousness and the program of the cooperative commonwealth, his

very legislative and administrative achievements after election would provide most of the electorate's necessary enlightenment. Conversely, a Socialist movement which by many painstaking campaigns had finally come into power without a Roosevelt could almost certainly be swept out of power by the appearance on the political scene of an anti-Socialist Roosevelt, no matter how thorough the Socialist education of the electorate might have been.

Bearing upon this point, one of the sections of the Socialist Party's national constitution must seem particularly mischievous. It is that which requires a Comrade to have been a member of the Party for at least two years before he may be nominated or endorsed for any public office by any Party subdivision, unless the subdivisions have not been in existence for two years. True, the consent of the state organization may invalidate this ruling, but that consent is cumbersome of attainment, and many of the state constitutions, notably New York's, repeat the rule of the national constitution. The rule was obviously designed to prevent a popular personality from entering the Party in order to exploit it for his personal ends. But if the members of the Party cannot be trusted to form a personal judgment of their own fellow members, with what can they be trusted, particularly since in the selection of their nominees the tendency would be to select

those of long membership and service-record, and since there inevitably would be a prejudice against the selection for high nomination of a recent convert, no matter how captivating his personality? Many political leaders of national or at least of local influence, chafing under the present leadership of the old political parties, must be restrained from casting in their lot with the Socialists only by the realization that thereby they would be rendering themselves politically impotent for leadership and occupancy of public office for a period of time. This procedure is especially deplorable in view of the fact that, outside of Debs and some ten or twelve other chieftains, the Socialist Party of America lacks leaders who inspire public confidence or general popular support, so that for many nominations on the Socialist ticket the only available candidates seem to be of the type which Mr. H. L. Mencken calls the "rabble-rouser."

In the third place, and as a corollary of the preceding considerations, the Socialist movement in the United States seems blissfully unaware of the part played by administrative ability in the conduct of Government, capitalist or socialist. True, this disregard of the personal factor in guiding the ship of state may have little effect upon the success of Socialist political campaigns. But it would have a decisive effect upon the fortunes of a Socialist state if the electorate—ever susceptible to passing whims and prone to perform as-

tonishly at the polls—should at some election in the near future suddenly and unexpectedly yield to the Socialist Party's exhortations, and return it to power. The Socialists evidently pin their faith to the ability of the untrained proletariat, serene in the confidence that executive experience will prove unnecessary in administering the railroads and the banks or in the purchase of building materials for the erection of schools and apartment-houses. The more conservative Socialists will answer that the Socialist state would engage for those tasks the McAdoos and the Hineses and the Vanderlips and the Hoovers, and there will be little dispute that they should be so engaged. But it may well be doubted if the temper of most of the membership of the Socialist Party at the present time would sanction or tolerate the hiring of these bourgeois experts for the highest offices within the Socialist Government, aside from those of a purely technical nature. (And this in spite of the example set by Lenin.) The dream of most Socialists is an all-Socialist administration, following success at the polls; and at the present time there is probably not sufficient material within the Socialist Party of America to fill efficiently merely the ten Cabinet positions. And even if the mass of the Socialists could be reconciled to seeing the Socialist state working out its destiny through the medium of non-Socialist or even anti-Socialist expert administrators, it may

be doubted also if the McAdoos and the Hoovers would accept the positions offered. For the political parties to which they belong would almost certainly be feverishly planning to upset the Socialist Government at the next election. Moreover, the pressure of their business and social connections would probably rather keep them at the task of administering private enterprises still in competition with the Government enterprises (and at the inception of a Socialist Government there would be many of them) so efficiently as to bring business defeat upon the enterprises being conducted for the Socialist Government by largely untrained and untried proletarians, by intellectuals or by mass-meeting speakers, and hence so as to bring ruin and repudiation upon the entire Socialist administration.

In this connection, there may be considered the common objection to the Socialist program on the ground that Governmental activities make for graft and inefficiency. To this objection, the conventional Socialist reply is four-fold. (1) The maximum as well as the minimum income in the Socialist state might be fixed, so that if an individual's income in any year rose sharply beyond that which he could realize from his salary and his past savings, it would cause suspicion and investigation. Obviously, a Socialist state should be better able to ferret out concealed income than our present capitalist state. The grafter would

find it harder to translate his graft into a form which would redound soon and appreciably to his credit; and although this method could not be counted upon completely to eliminate graft, yet it should go far to make graft less frequent, smaller in amount and more difficult of attainment. (2) The inefficiency in the present Government service is due largely to the greater inducements offered by private enterprise, a contrast which should be eliminated in the Cooperative Commonwealth. (3) The present Governmental activities do not affect the daily lives of most people in ways that they can directly ascertain; whereas when the Government takes over the milk supply and the grocery stores and the department stores, people will understand directly how they are benefited or injured. Thus, when even railroad service is inefficient, it is apt to be only the business men who complain, while the great mass of the voters are apathetic to the attack thus launched upon their pocketbooks. But let graft and inefficiency raise the cost of milk several cents a quart, or meat five cents a pound, or overcoats five dollars each, or kerosene three cents a gallon, or apartment rentals one hundred dollars a year, and the people will rout out the graft and inefficiency thus brought home so nakedly to their daily lives. Similarly, when the political sagacity of the electorate is decried, the Socialist replies that the voter is better able to form an

intelligent opinion of the kind of service he is getting in the furnishing of milk, clothing and housing than of the kind of service he is getting in foreign relations, property evaluation for taxes and even tariff administration. Indeed, it may well be that the projection of the Government into the fields of clothing and housing and food may prove a most serviceable step in insuring an intelligent selection of public officials by the electorate.

(4) And finally, the Socialist answers that even granting individual graft and inefficiency, the loss due to them will be more than atoned for by the elimination of the social graft and inefficiency known as the acquisition of profits. A five per cent loss on transactions due to graft and another five per cent due to inefficiency should be more than met by the elimination of the loss due to allowing a certain percentage as profit to owners—and in the months following the War, few were the transactions in which net profits were as low as ten per cent.

However, the last of these considerations may prove less valid than the three preceding. For it is probable that in the United States Socialism will arrive, if it arrives at all, by slow gradations rather than by an abrupt break. And in the course of those gradations, it is almost inevitable that sops will be thrown to the growing pro-Socialist sentiment in the form of further and further Government supervision over the private enterprises

for which the Socialists demand Government ownership and operation. Just so, the feeling for Government ownership and operation of the railroads has been staved off by creating an Interstate Commerce Commission, and by granting it increased powers over railroad rates and hence over railroad profits, routing, equipment and general service. And if a Socialist State were to take over the ownership and management of industries whose operations, and especially whose profits, had previously been rigorously regulated, there might well be little social graft in the form of profits left to be eliminated.

That is, the profits being made under the system of state regulation preceding the assumption of state ownership and management might well be hardly above the legitimate interest for the use of capital. And legitimate interest for the use of capital will have to be paid by the state as owner and operator no less than by a private owner and operator. (Much of the current criticism of the Socialist program by professional political economists is based on the belief that Socialism overlooks the need of paying for the use of capital by means of interest. The truth is, of course, that Socialism would have the state furnish the capital. But this misunderstanding is hardly unexpected, in view of the seeming ignorance of so many American economists that there is a Socialism which is not Marxian and which is based on

something beside the labor theory of value.) If the Government were to take over the railroads, for instance, from their operation would have to be met the interest on the enormous bond issue floated to buy them, even at their physical valuation alone; or else the interest to be guaranteed the owners of the railroad securities, in case the Government adopted that plan of conducting the railroad enterprises. Under such circumstances, the question as to whether the operation of railroads and of other large business undertakings under Socialism would prove more economical than their operation under the capitalist system would probably hinge upon the availability to the Socialist state of the services of a McAdoo or a Hines or a Hoover.

At all events, the assumption of power by a Socialist administration which would turn over the reins of Government to officials who neither by experience nor by personal ability had been trained to administer would spell ruin. For the technical work in the clothing factories, the packing-houses and the railway repair shops, the workers themselves could be confidently held responsible—or else the principle and practise of democracy hold no meaning. But in sheer executive administration *qua* executive administration, the proletariat can hardly be relied upon to acquit itself nobly. We in the United States have been told that leaders of the British Labor Party,

with its respectable roster of trained executive administrators of reputation, privately admit that British Labor has not yet developed sufficient executive ability to administer the complex affairs of the British Empire. How much more earnestly, then, should the untried American Socialist movement take thought on this problem of administrative ability as it campaigns for offices of high responsibility! The difficulties of meeting the problems of government administration in a Socialist state cannot be pushed aside by emphasizing the all-too-apparent inefficiency of the highest administrators in the capitalist state and in the capitalist system, any more than by romantically endowing the proletariat with a sudden gift of administrative genius when once it has the power to obtain the full product of its toil.

In the fourth place, the Socialist movement in the United States, like the other radical or "liberal" movements, must learn the essentially unintellectual nature of the electorate's interests and sympathies. The electorate's most open avenue of approach is not that of reasoning; the appeal for its support must warm the cockles of its emotions before success may be dreamed of. And its emotions are sunk deep in prejudices and preconceptions which either are not realized by most of those who read and write books and weekly reviews, or else the strength of which is not appreciated by the book-readers and -writ-

ers. The concepts which control the decisions of the man in the street have been handed down from generation to generation almost unaffected by the education and the culture of the intellectual classes. There is too much calm assumption that information will work up and down from one intellectual class to another, instead of frank recognition that the tendency is rather for information to expand laterally within the same intellectual class. There is a more violent contrast between the current concepts of the upper and lower intellectual classes within a given nation of even a homogeneous culture than between the general national concepts of whole nations even so dissimilar in their cultures as France and the United States. It may well be doubted if even the least cloistered leaders of the Socialist and other radical and liberal movements have more than the faintest understanding of the concepts of the man in the street regarding religious differences, sex morality, the place of woman generally in the scheme of the Universe, the value of college education, the questioning of conventions, polished manners, the habit of criticism, and all the other manifold personal concepts which not only enter into, but even determine, the man in the street's judgment of political parties and movements. The "intelligentsia" in New York recently made merry when a high official of the New York City government decried libraries as "places

where people read themselves to death and then come out with theories to overthrow the Government," and when another high official of the same government announced that policemen were better off without much education; but the intelligentsia fails to appreciate how high a percentage of the population, especially the male population, endorses these statements of the New York City officials.

It is this comprehension of the true nature of the masses' mental processes which is signified by the phrase, "Understanding politics." When a college professor or a society matron is rejected by the cognoscenti as a candidate for a political nomination on the grounds of "not understanding politics," the rejection does not mean primarily that politics and the game of politics have rules, methods and tactics which are apart from other fields of human endeavor, and which must be carefully studied and mastered of and for themselves. It means rather that the college professor or the society matron is blissfully unaware of the actual mental reasoning, prejudices and allegiances of the great mass of the people who make up the country. Some day an iconoclastic sociologist, abandoning his text books, his prehistoric excavations and his psychological laboratory, will achieve an enviable reputation overnight by living for several years wholly in such an environment as is to be found, for instance, in the Lower West

Side of New York City and eventually publishing to a startled world of book-readers and -writers a list and discussion of what the book-readers and -writers will very accurately term the mediæval conceptions and prejudices which guide the opinions of the great majority of Americans.

For instance, the greatest obstacle now hindering the growth of Socialist sentiment in the United States is a deep suspicion in the minds of many voters that Socialism is fundamentally a Jewish movement, designed to further the aims of Jewry; and also a movement which favors, practises, and would establish what is euphemistically described as "free love." Doubtless, the inculcation of this belief was inevitable, and is in no wise to be blamed upon the Socialist movement. But so long as that belief persists, it will be difficult for the movement to get ahead. Probably it is chiefly in the small towns and the rural districts that the "free love" accusation is credited, for in the larger centers most non-Socialists have come sufficiently into personal contact with Socialists to recognize that in the field of morals the Socialists rank at least no lower than the remainder of the population. But it is just in the larger centers that the Socialist membership seems to be disproportionately Jewish. It is not a question of explaining the fact or of deploring anti-Semitism; it is a question of recognizing the strength of this factor which influences the situation in actuality.

As a matter of practical tactics, therefore, the Socialist movement's chief point of attack for the present should be the "free love" and the "Jewish movement" allegations.

And the attack must not confine itself to pamphlets and statistics, meetings of protest and similar agencies which, so far as the mass of the people are concerned, may well be considered "intellectual." Again, the leaders of the Socialist and the other radical and liberal movements are wont to overestimate the influence of the printed word in forming public opinion. It is not merely the unwillingness of large proportions of people to read written argument; it is also their sheer inability to understand it or to concentrate their minds upon it. I have met people to whom the pages of the *Saturday Evening Post* seemed extremely difficult and heavy reading, and who were by no means quasi-illiterate or foreign-born—indeed, were of the economically well-to-do. And it is not alone such persons whose opinions are formed by rumors and whispered gossip—even many of those who have read a pamphlet will disbelieve it on the word of a friend who has a friend who told him, etc. American public opinion on the welfare of Labor at the present time, for instance, revolves around the rumor that most workingmen made a practise of buying twelve-dollar silk shirts in the years of war far more effectively, so far as a vote at the polls would

be concerned, than around the detailed and painstaking figures on the cost of living and wages issued by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Without attempting to construct a comprehensive campaign program for the American Socialist movement, I think it could be proved that at the present time far more helpful to it than all its street meetings and pamphlets would be an active, representative and country-wide campaign by a group of Christian Socialists, with as large a proportion of Christian ministers as possible, telling the country at large that to them the aims of Socialism, and the aims of Socialism alone among the political parties, were synonymous with the ideals of Christianity as applied to government. Along with such a campaign, of course, would have to go a strong increase of membership in the Socialist movement from the non-Jewish elements of the population, so that there would no longer be a disproportionate number of Jews in the Socialist ranks.

Finally, the Socialist movement would do well to emphasize more strongly than at present its remedy against a possible excess of population arising through increased social welfare—increased income to the family for each child only to the limited number of children seen to be desirable for the continuation of that social welfare, with even decreased wages or salaries for parents who have children too far in excess of the limit

set, unless possibly by exceptions allowed those with manifestly and abnormally favorable heredity.

On this entire question of tactics, it may be remarked in conclusion that for a person sympathetic with the aims of Socialism, the only position of effectiveness at present seems to be within the political Socialist movement in America. True, the most satisfactory organization would manifestly be a general radical holding company, with the several groups maintaining their own autonomy, their own creeds and their own platforms, and constantly endeavoring to convert their associates to their own way of thinking; but in political campaigns, and against the common enemy, loyally maintaining a united front in accord with the majority decision within the general inclusive organization. However, such a desideratum seems not to be possible at present, unless by an almost unbelievable identification of President Harding's administration with all the forces of reactionary capitalism. With all its faults of both principle and practise, there is yet no other vehicle so readily available as the Socialist Party to carry forward the Socialist message in the United States. It should be as practicable, if not more practicable, to bore at it from within as at the American Federation of Labor. It will hardly be contended that either of the old political parties, as

they are now constituted, can be headed toward a socialistic goal, be it ever so thickly disguised under other names. Capitalistic ideology has a firm grip upon the dictators of the Republican Party's policies, and the voting strength of the Democratic Party lies in the negro-baiting South and among the Southern agricultural Junkers. It was no accident that a Burleson was high in power in the last Democratic administration—indeed, it was largely through his and his type's influence with the Southern congressmen and senators that the considerable legislative achievements of the first Wilson administration were realized; and the marvel was rather that from 1913 to 1921 there were so few Burlesons in high positions.

As for "Liberalism," it has proved itself peculiarly futile, even more futile than the Socialist movement. The creed which is loosely called "Liberalism" in America today has undoubtedly rendered great service in the past and will conceivably render great service in the future. Liberalism in England has been invaluable to the cause of progress. But it seems to me that there is one paralyzing difference between the liberalism of Gladstone and Morley, which, after all, was effective and forward-urging, and the creed which now calls itself liberalism in America. The liberalism of Gladstone and Morley was couched in ethical formulas which, however platitudinous and even

hypocritical, yet bore within them the germs of inspiration and enthusiasm for the great mass of the people. Whereas such a liberalism as that represented by the *New Republic*, for instance, seems to be concerned primarily with administrative technique and intellectual efficiency. Those who have followed the development of the present-day American movement or creed known as Liberalism surely will agree that it hardly fits into the definition of liberalism which Morley gives in his "Recollections," beginning with "Respect for the dignity and worth of the individual is its (Liberalism's) root." And emphasis on efficiency and technique alone, however necessary and however more serviceable ultimately than recourse to mere undefined and unanalyzed ethical platitudes, can hardly rally popular support around it.

At all events, and whatever the causes, our American liberals have proved themselves ineffective in the maelstrom of the past several years, and their liberalism has been sadly discredited. The Presidential election of 1920 was proof sufficient that they had no power to guide either of the major political parties toward Liberalism's goals; and by remaining outside of the Socialist movement, they left little impression upon the country. And the power of the trade-union movement to accomplish the ends of Socialism need not be discussed here, for the question is of political action. Individual Socialists as well as

the Socialist Party of America are actively supporting the trade-unions, both those in the American Federation of Labor and those outside the Pale.

I have reserved for the last any mention of the Farmer-Labor Party because in essence the Farmer-Labor Party is a mildly Socialistic movement. It seems to recognize the class struggle, if only distantly. It emerges from its first presidential campaign, in 1920, with practically no farmer support, despite its name; and with a platform hardly to be distinguished from the immediate platform of the Socialist Party, except for a slightly greater admixture of self-government in industry than the latter. The Farmer-Labor Party is still too young and its future too uncertain for prediction concerning its ultimate service to be more than foolhardiness; only time can tell whether it or the Socialist Party is better qualified to advance the Socialist banner. Similarly, only time can tell whether there is sufficient enthusiasm for it among its members to inspire them to perform between elections, without hope of reward in the shape of political office, the routine organization work and propaganda necessary for its permanence and success. However, one essential difference between it and the Socialist Party of America at the present time must be stressed. It is that, however much the two platforms may agree, and however much more realistic the Social-

ist phraseology has become than in previous years, the ultimate aims of the Socialists are revolutionary. Everyone understands that a socialist society will differ from our present capitalist society to a revolutionary degree in almost all phases of human activity. If the 1920 program of the Farmer-Labor Party should be realized, the economic problem of the ownership of the basic industries would be solved largely according to the Socialist formula, but a wholly revolutionary program would otherwise hardly be attempted. There would be a radical change in industry, but hardly a radical change in the point of view dominating society as a whole. Whereas, by plain implication as well as by frank confession, the Socialist Party aims, however crudely, at a wholly new social point of view. The former at present stands for a narrow Socialism; the latter aims, or may be made to aim, at a larger Socialism.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE LARGER SOCIALISM.

THE larger Socialism stands for the adoption of so comprehensive a Socialist point of view, and for its adoption in so liberal and so empirical a spirit, as to assist materially in the success of all other revolutionary, radical or even merely liberal movements and thought also working toward a better adjusted universe. The larger Socialism refuses to stop at the socialization of industry. It believes that the principle of Socialism will be served as inadequately by its application only in industry as the principle of democracy has been served by its application only in political government. It realizes that the political Socialist movement bears to Socialism as a whole much the same relation that woman suffrage bears to the woman's movement as a whole. It insists that the material welfare resulting from the advent of Socialism shall be used merely as the foundation on which to build loftier structures. The larger Socialism recognizes that along with and dependent upon the success of the political and economic Socialist movement there must proceed to their

fruition such movements as eugenics and feminism, for example. The elimination of the congenitally unfit, the transformation of the married woman from an economic dependent, the endowment of motherhood, the conscious control of conception, the application of similar standards of sex morality to women and men, the liberalization of family ties, the scientific training of children before the kindergarten age as accepted at present—these and similar derivatives of the eugenics movement and the woman's movement are but faint reminders of the inadequacy of a Socialism that will end its exertions with the triumph of Socialism in socially-necessary industry and in Government. The larger Socialism understands that in its political platform it cannot include such contentious non-political reforms, but it understands also that it must throw its energies into the furtherance of such reforms when its political program has been achieved. Socialism in this larger sense thus aims not merely at a new principle in government and industry, but at a completely new orientation in every field of human endeavor.

The underlying concept of our present capitalist society is that the individual has a vested right to prosper even at the expense of society, unless the social damage wrought by his success is too glaring and too serious. Production occurs primarily for profit, and only through the opportunity for profit; and the profit accrues to the

individual who is strong and crafty enough in the competition of business wits to climb toward the top of the business ladder. Under capitalism, business ability still is conceived as having a vested interest in society's opportunities. Whatever checks exist upon the able business man's exploitation of the community's needs are largely negative—we have forbidden him to advance himself by adulterating food, or by manufacturing whisky, or by managing roulette wheels and faro games. For the rest, he is entitled to wring tribute from society in the form of profits, as long as the profits are not too disproportionately large, or unless the community is not temporarily at war, or in similar unusual conditions. Organized society at present exists, not for the welfare of all its members, weak as well as strong, but for the welfare of the strong. The weak are left to prosper or suffer as an incident of the activities of the strong. Aside from a scanty number of negative checks, it is felt that the state has no right to proscribe the prosperity of the few nor called upon to assure prosperity to the many.

Against this individualistically anarchistic philosophy, Socialism sets firmly a social point of view. Not that a social point of view and a socialist point of view are necessarily synonymous, or that a social point of view may not be developed outside, or even in opposition to, the Socialist point of view. But the goal aimed at by Socialism

is that of the greatest social welfare, and the standards set by Socialism are social standards. With the advent of a Socialist state, these standards would become the reigning standards in the economic field, and the standards set by the economic activities are apt to fix the standards of most other activities. Conversely, it is probably impossible, or at least supremely difficult, to stimulate society to a social point of view in fields of endeavor outside of business, if the business point of view is anti-social. Even those proponents of movements and thought which are anti-Socialistic, but which are aimed at higher social welfare, would probably find that the establishment of a Socialist state would immeasurably aid them by its general stimulus to most people to begin to think in social terms.

Thus, there are students of our economic organization who believe that economic production and distribution should be left largely to private initiative because otherwise economic production and distribution cannot be managed efficiently. These students are quite as socially-minded as the Socialists. Their point of view is as much one of social welfare as is the Socialistic point of view. They are unwilling to uproot the capitalists' hold on our economic processes, not because of consideration for the capitalists, but because of consideration for those economic processes. But under such an arrangement, it would be difficult for the

great mass of people to appreciate that the capitalists were not maintaining their position because of their vested rights to profit at the expense of society. Their maintenance of their position because of their social service would be recognized only obscurely, and the acquisition of a general social point of view in all fields of human endeavor would be but slightly stimulated.

Not that Socialism can close its eyes to the danger that individualism may be suppressed or discouraged with the development of the social point of view by the Cooperative Commonwealth. 111
The larger Socialism recognizes that individualism must be tolerated, even encouraged; not because, as under Capitalism, individualism enjoys vested interests and natural rights, but because it is to the welfare of the whole that the recalcitrant single parts should be allowed to present their case. Thus, the conscientious objector must be tolerated, even in time of actual military invasion, not because he has an inherent moral right to go counter to the will of the majority; but because it is for the encouragement of truth, and hence ultimately to the benefit of the majority, that minorities be allowed free rein to present truth as it appears to them. If Lloyd George had been sent to jail for twenty years for opposing his country's prosecution of the Boer War, in all probability Germany would have won the World War. X

Feminism and eugenics have been instanced as

two of the developments sprouting from the foundation of the political Socialist state which are necessary to the realization of the larger aims and possibilities of Socialism. Now, the most formidable obstacle to the advancement of movements such as feminism and eugenics, as to the advancement of Socialism itself, is psychological. It is the reluctance, indeed, the hostility, of most people even to consider abandoning old concepts for new. An excellent example of this psychological barrier to progress is furnished by the present agitation in the United States for a classless dissemination of knowledge concerning birth control. When its proponents go before a state legislature and plead for the repeal of laws forbidding physicians and nurses to inform women how to prevent the conception of infants whose birth would be a calamity for both infants and mothers, their logic is unanswerable. But their arguments beat futilely against a stone wall of established custom and prejudices which is so thick that years of ceaseless propaganda and skilful organization are necessary before their case can get a hearing simply on its own merits. It required some seventy years of such effort to gain woman suffrage; and that was gained, not so much through man's final willingness to consider a new idea fairly, as through the economic projection of women into new fields, and through the need of women's economic help in the prosecution of the World War.

There is not only deafness toward a new idea just because of its newness—there is also, as so convincingly portrayed by Mr. Galsworthy in “The Island Pharisees,” fierce anger against the innovator for his mere questioning of the old ideas. Unsophisticated youths fresh from their books or their college halls expect disagreement with and inattention to their “advanced” creeds; but all too many abandon their crusade because they are unprepared for the gusts of hatred which rake them fore and aft for their temerity in merely doubting. They are regarded not only as enemies, but as traitors. In so defending himself against radical Youth, the conservative is fond of basing his hostility to change on the ground that the status quo represents the result of years of long, painful and illuminating experience on the part of the world; but he seldom can prove that the status quo has so logical a *raison d’être*. The status quo is apt to be rather the result of a chance decision, which, when once made, became surrounded by the halo of custom and convention. It is by chance, not by experience, that our telegraph, telephones, express service and railroads were given over to and kept in private hands. If chance had decreed otherwise, most of the present resorters to the “mankind’s long years of experience” argument to oppose government operation would just as firmly and on the same grounds oppose private operation. It took defeat

in the greatest of all wars to persuade the German people to examine their Constitution on its merits; from present indications, the examination of the American Constitution by the American people on its merits belongs to the dim and distant future when the circle is squared and perpetual motion is discovered. The fiercest expounders of the doctrine that the American Constitution was directly inspired of God were the fiercest denouncers of the German people for being so ridiculous as to suppose that God, the only true God, would choose any one people as the object of his favors. It requires much inner wrestling with scepticism before one can persuade oneself that this type of mind, if by chance born and dwelling in Germany in 1914, would not have vociferously joined the "Gott mit uns" chant until the Second Battle of the Marne.

Perhaps the day is not remote when the biologists and psychologists will explain in full and final detail why the mind so works that it derives pleasure from rehearsing an idea to which it has become accustomed, and extreme displeasure at the effort called forth to permit a new idea to plough an unblazed trail through the mind's cells. At present, only the fact itself can be recorded. Doubtless, the mind will ever be friendly to old ideas and hostile to new, unless most conscientiously disciplined. Also, the minds in power will particularly so tend because they will generally be

the older minds, and, other things being equal, the older minds will be less receptive to novelty than the younger. At all events, conservatism will probably always have the advantage in strength and position, and radicalism or mere progressivism or liberalism be always under a handicap. The rare exception will occur when countries like Revolutionary Russia in March, 1917, start on their career with a practically clean slate; and as letters and figures and drawings begin to appear on the slate, the old pro-old and anti-new trend will reassert itself. Society under the larger Socialism thus must consciously provide every encouragement for radical thought, consciously conceiving itself in duty bound to prepare the soil for new doctrines, and consciously recognizing that its preference for the old concepts may be but prejudice.

But if the Socialism which comes into its own with the advent of a Socialist state should be the deductive and didactic Marxism deriving from formulas of the past, most progressive non-socialist movements will have as hard a row to hoe under Socialism as under capitalism. The mind which believes that spiritual and political truth was once for all time expounded by the Bible and the Constitution is no more a closed mind than the mind which believes that economic truth was once for all time expounded by the *Communist Manifesto* and *Capital*. True, at the present time even

Marxian American Socialists are receptive to innovations, such as the programs of feminism and eugenics; but they are thus receptive largely because their Socialism, being still severely unsuccessful, has all the trappings of a radical movement, so that its supporters are still inclined to embrace most other radical movements. But let the Marxian Socialists once become successful, and Marxian Socialism become the established order, and then well may new radical movements beware! Of course, those other older radical movements which had been advocated by the Marxians in their own days of struggle, such, doubtless, as feminism and eugenics, will remain in good standing, because of the earlier affiliations and allegiances. But new radical non-Socialist movements arising after the success of a Socialism drawing its inspiration primarily from deductions of the past will find themselves confronted by a trenchant prejudice against any other deductions not also derived from the Word and the Law.

The present prejudice against innovation expresses itself in the state of mind which is called "intolerant" by those who have schooled themselves to be receptive toward innovation. Now, the difference between the tolerant mind and the intolerant mind is due chiefly to the former's understanding that the truth has not yet been completely exposed beyond amendment or addition; and to the latter's conviction that the truth, the

whole truth, and nothing but the truth has been already revealed, so that iconoclasm against the revelation must be false and wicked. Intolerance toward the I.W.W., the pacifist, the prostitute, the atheist can be understood and explained only by the assurance that there is not even the slightest possibility that they can be right in their courses. Indeed, if capitalism, militarism, chastity and Deism are as eternally and self-evidently true as the Chambers of Commerce, the one hundred per cent Americans, the anti-vice societies and the evangelists believe them to be, then the treatment meted out to the I.W.W., the pacifists, the prostitutes and the atheists is justified. If one were compelled to choose a single gauge by which to measure the virtue of a civilization, most of us would probably choose tolerance.

This is all elemental enough, but if it is disregarded by the Socialist movement, the Socialist state will present to the world a civilization but slightly preferable to that which it supplanted, and certainly not in conformity with the roseate hopes for a purer social order held and held out by most Socialists. If Socialism arrives in the spirit of the old deductive, dogmatic, special dispensation Marxism, and not largely in the spirit of what is here termed the larger Socialism, it will necessarily prove itself as intolerant toward new ideas in violation of its own as Capitalism has proved itself.

For instance, how will the Socialist state conduct the schools? Will it continue the present-day methods by which hard-and-fast formulas are fastened upon the child's mind; or will it present standards of conduct as evolutionary, and current values as relative? Will it suppress all undermining criticism of Socialism in the public schools as ruthlessly as capitalism suppresses all fair consideration of Socialism today, and as ruthlessly as we have been told that Soviet Russia suppresses hostile criticism of the principles of Bolshevism? If it will, it will be prostituting its promise. For much of the intolerance of our present system of society has been deliberately inculcated by the finality with which concepts have been foisted on most of us in the lower schools. Herein lies another reason why Youth is unable to carry on for his earlier resolutions after leaving the world of books and school-teachers. He has been taught that the good is wholly good and the evil wholly evil, that the issues by which he will be confronted are palpably all white or all black; and he is first confused and then discouraged as he gropes his way through this gray and brown world of partly and obscurely good and partly and debatably evil. The larger Socialism would conscientiously present its education as an efficient medical school today presents the study of medicine. Medical students are given current findings in medicine largely from an evolutionary point of

view; they are shown how the accepted treatment of today was not the accepted treatment of yesterday, and are warned that it well may not be the accepted treatment of tomorrow. They are hence taught to be as receptive to new theories and new practises in medicine as it is possible for naturally conservative humans to be; and in like manner the larger Socialism, an evolutionary and not a determinist growth, would strive to inculcate the receptive state of mind in its school-children.

Again, the larger Socialism would insist that the standards sketched even thus tentatively in its schools be applied to contemporaneous problems, and not allowed to atrophy in the pupil's mind through lack of employment. Under our present educational methods, the student's understanding of the problems of life is as effective as would be his understanding of arithmetic if he were taught the multiplication table, but never induced to apply it to concrete arithmetical problems. The world of the school-room and the world outside the school-room are rigidly quarantined against each other. The standards taught and the conduct practised in the one world are seldom integrated with the standards and conduct of the other. Thus we develop a type of mind which strenuously insists that the American colonies had every right to free themselves from English rule, at the same time that it is either apathetic or hostile to Ireland's struggle to free itself from British rule. So far

as appreciation of our contemporaneous radicals and non-conformists is concerned, our school-children might never have been taught that most of the noteworthy figures of the past were the radicals and non-conformists of their generations. That it was glorious to be more advanced than one's age in the past they are taught so inapplicably that they seem never to surmise that it might be glorious also to be ahead of one's own age in the present.

Socialism in this larger sense is thus primarily concerned with the kind of man produced under a socialistic instead of under a capitalistic order of society, rather than merely with the material contrast between those orders. From this viewpoint, its indictment of our present civilization for unnecessary lack of leisure for the great mass of people is severer than its indictment for undue lack of physical well-being, as evidenced by unnecessarily low wages. The validity of this evaluation is indicated by the fact that in our recent burst of prosperity large numbers of the workers, even allowing for capitalistic anxiety to make out a case against Labor, seem to have preferred to support themselves comfortably on four days' work per week, rather than enjoy luxuries as a result of six days' work per week, especially when the work was monotonous or laborious. And in

the program for a Socialist state, if it should prove impossible, particularly in the early years, to grant to the workers an altogether socially desirable scale in both wages and in hours of toil, the larger Socialism would reduce the hours of toil rather than increase wages—always providing that production is sufficiently high so that the hours of toil can be lowered without cutting production to the danger point, and providing that the wages already being paid are sufficient to provide the necessities of life.

The larger Socialism would make that decision largely with the view of affording every possible facility for greater numbers to come into contact with the inspiring or clarifying type of books, art, music, speeches, meetings, and even sermons. For it is the present lack of contact of the great majority of people with the written or spoken inspiration driving most of the intellectuals, radicals and idealists forward which accounts for much of the present all-too-apparent hold of sophistry, prejudice, conservatism and crass materialism and self-seeking upon popular opinion and action. The intellectuals, radicals and idealists are prone to be cast down that their new programs and ethical appeals seem so uniformly and decisively rejected of men. But they are so rejected very largely because to those with whom the ultimate rejection or acceptance lies, the stimuli which animated the intellectuals, Social-

ists and idealists are generally unable to gain access. Not only does the length of absorption required today in modern industry and business, for employer as well as for employee, afford little leisure for thought and mental exhilaration; but also the intensity of the personal effort required is apt to exhaust the mind to the point where thought and mental exhilaration can make no impression, even if occasionally the sheer leisure for them should be available. It is reported of Browning that every morning before beginning his day's composition he would read some pages of Shakespeare, in order to transport himself into the rarefied atmosphere. Similarly, the atmosphere in which the intellectuals, Socialists and idealists move has been created largely from outside inspiration. For the success of their causes, the daily lives of most of us must also be so ordered as to bar that inspiration from taking hold of our minds only by the degree to which those minds are inherently impervious to it.

Thus, the Socialist roused to a white heat of indignation and high resolve in the protest-meeting is generally unappreciative of the fact that probably the great majority of his fellowmen have seldom dwelled in the protest-meeting atmosphere, except possibly during Liberty Loan drives. Upon the busy outside world which has no time for protest-meetings, he fails to impress his generous impulses because the outside world can-

not appreciate nor understand them apart from the atmosphere in which they are conceived. And perhaps the arch-consummation of the Socialist state would be the extension of the atmosphere of the protest-meeting and even the soap-box exhortation until it became the atmosphere in which most of us received our stimulation, acquired our fundamental conceptions, made our effective resolves. The reports which have come out of Soviet Russia indicate that such an atmosphere has been prevailing in Moscow, for instance, to the extent that it has not been literally smothered by cold, disease and malnutrition. If that atmosphere has managed to keep alive, even to strengthen, the influence of the more inspiring books, pamphlets, dramas, music, art and addresses in that hapless land, where material sufferings might well have been expected to still all impulses except those of obtaining surcease from want, surely it holds vast possibilities of rejuvenating economically more fortunate lands.

Doubtless, it must be confessed that, even with full leisure and mental opportunity to dwell under the influence of the more ennobling stimuli of life, many persons, perhaps even the majority, will prove to be still either antagonistic or apathetic to them. But beyond the limitations set by the old Adam, even the larger Socialism does not pretend to be able to go. Its possibilities will have been realized when the factors working against the old

Adam's limitations upon human progress shall have come into their own, and shall have been vouchsafed full scope for their power. Doubtless, also, permeation of the social milieu by the protest-meeting atmosphere will have a baneful effect upon the individual's productive efficiency. If that be the case, Socialism from this larger point of view will be deliberately preferring comfort with leisure to luxury without leisure. For the man who can listen, with ears keenly attuned, to the still, small music of the inspirational forces of the ages and of his own era, and at the same time can wade lustily and effectively into the concrete business problems of the twentieth century, with each of these sides of his nature complementing rather than hampering the other, that man is so rare as fittingly to deserve the appellation of "genius." Rather, the mind easily and fervently aroused to enthusiasm is apt to be the mind with a feeble grasp upon the concrete realities and problems of the factory and the workshops. Conversely, even a firm grip upon the realities of material business problems is apt to be loosened when the mind finds itself constantly assailed by inspiration from the world of books, music, drama, religion or intellectual devotion. It seems not to be the same world as that of our mundane everyday business efforts.

On the other hand, the broadening of the world of books and art into more general popular ap-

peal may well have the effect of closing the gap between that world and the world of our everyday mundane efforts and routine experiences. At the present time, the world of books and art is ruled largely by the upper intellectual classes. At least, the standards in that world are set by those classes. Now, the upper intellectual classes are composed to a very large extent of those whose economic position is secure, of those who live by intellectual work, or of those who fall within both categories. As a rule, the inspiration they derive from books and art is not immediately and without paraphrase transferred into actual deeds of the everyday world. Therefore, the kind of action portrayed in the works which are ranked highest according to present literary standards is often, if not usually, the kind of action which would be ranked lowest in the world of actual experience. Good example is furnished by Browning's dazzlingly brilliant *Porphyria's Lover*. By all present literary standards, this poem of sixty lines must be ranked as nothing short of a masterpiece. Yet in the actual world of action, the deed it so glowingly celebrates must be classed as sheer homicide, and the character who reveals himself so sympathetically in the dramatic monologue must be punished as a mere criminal. I am not suggesting that this type of literature now dear to the intellectual and æsthetic aristocracy must be abandoned or frowned upon in the days when

opportunities for literary appreciation are greatly broadened, largely through leisure. All that is being suggested is that in those days the literary standards may be set by a much wider number and class of judges than at present, even with some semblance of democratic procedure in the evaluation of literature; and that the literary productions which accordingly will gain the highest accepted applause will be those whose stimuli are directly applicable to the actual problems of modern highly organized life, not merely to æsthetic enjoyment. Even in the field of literature, service in terms of action may become the gauge of greatness, instead of our present individualistic and unpragmatic gauge.

But Socialism's indictment against the capitalist system's influence over the character of man rests not alone, and not fundamentally, upon man's lack of leisure under capitalism to attune himself as far as may be to the more inspiring forces of the universe and products of his fellowman. The basic Socialist indictment of Capitalism rests upon Capitalism's economic discouragement of service by the individual to society. Conversely, it is the basic virtue of a Socialist system of society that it would hold out the highest rewards to those who served mankind most bountifully, and would strive to discountenance the anti-social economic effort. It is only necessary to observe the am-

bitious of youths before and after entering the business world today to recognize the antithesis between the conduct rewarded most highly under capitalism and the conduct previously mapped out for themselves by the more ambitious and the finer among such youths. Even those who seem well broken to the capitalistic harness before strapping it on themselves have usually been previously permeated, through their social and family connections, by the capitalistic standards of worldly prowess. True, they will find that under capitalism the qualities of individual honesty, frankness, sincerity, truthfulness and reliability are at a premium; but it is in the social effect of our business efforts that the capitalist system persistently lowers youth to and keeps man at a lower social level of character than even imperfect human nature warrants.

For the acquisition of wealth under capitalism derives usually from profiting at the expense of one's fellowmen. It is not necessary to deny the existence of striking exceptions to this statement in order to insist upon its general validity. The exceptions occur usually in the professions, such as medicine, teaching or, perhaps, social service; in the arts, and occasionally in the sciences. Only rarely do the exceptions occur in business, as when the safety razor or the Ford automobile or a new invention is perfected. But a civilization in the twentieth century takes its tone from its normal

business, rather than from its professions, its arts, its science or its unique business forms. The wealthy man under capitalism, as a rule, is he who has utilized to his own advantage the current economic system of producing and distributing goods. Any benefit which may accrue to society from his efforts accrues only incidentally, if at all.

And the acquisition of wealth, or the manifestation of large income, is the standard by which the great mass of the people gauge success. The intellectuals and the Socialists, who pay their tribute for personal success to intellectual, social service, scientific or artistic achievement, may recognize, even may recognize freely, the deference paid to wealth by the non-intellectual majority. But a book-reader or -writer, no matter how generously he may attempt to recognize that wealth and income provide the measure by which individuals and their careers are judged by most people, is still apt to be under the illusion that the sort of achievement which he praises has a firmer hold on the general populace than it actually has. America toadies to monetary achievement hardly less supinely than pre-war Germany toadied to military achievement. It is by no means the bell-hop and the waiter and Pullman porter alone whose conduct toward a stranger is guided by the amount of wealth his apparel connotes. The essential thing about a man, in the mind of Brooklyn, Montclair, Adams County, Marion, Main Street, Spoon

River, and Winesburg, Ohio, is his income. The intensity of their interest in how much Jones is worth, and if his daughter is "doing well" when she is betrothed, can hardly be exaggerated. All the power of social adulation is exerted to drive the modern man to get the better of society by deriving great wealth from it, and the modern woman to marry such a man; all the power of social rejection is exerted to prevent the modern man from choosing the ways which benefit society, but which lead to small income, and the modern woman from joining her life to that type. So long as modern business is conducted primarily for the individual business man's profit; so long as the average individual business man gains the highest profit by exploiting his consumers, his workmen, his competitors and the other businesses which serve his own; so long as he gains the least profit by being generous to the consumers, to his workmen, to his competitors and to the other businesses which dovetail into his, so long is he under pressure which makes well-nigh impossible any great faithfulness to ideals of living by serving his fellowman, and which makes well-nigh inevitable his frank or concealed adherence to the principle of serving himself at the expense of others. By its very essence, capitalism denies the validity of the higher ideals to which the church, literature and certain racially preservative instincts call us for homage, which cap-

ture our imagination, and which hold our allegiance. By its practises, capitalism supplants these ideals by courses of conduct which have only to be stated in the abstract to be condemned of us as unworthy of worship.

This indictment does not close its eyes to the inevitability, or even to the possible desirability, under any modern system of society, of gauging men's value by their monetary achievements. Man seems as incurably disposed to judge and evaluate his fellows as he is disposed to act so as to gain the commendation and to shun the condemnation of his fellows. And in modern complex society, doubtless size of income is the only generally available measure of personal evaluation, replacing the number of scalps of the Indians, the titles of nobility of some lands, the military rank of militarist nations. But under a Socialist system—and herein lies the supreme superiority of Socialism to Capitalism—the highest monetary rewards will appertain to the work which most highly benefits the community. With practically all men working for the state, that is, working for their fellows; and with the state apportioning salaries according to the value, difficulty and responsibility of the work performed, the greatest monetary reputation will accord to those who prove themselves most indispensable to the state, that is, to their fellows. The measure of the individual's prowess; the adulation, or perhaps even


the envy, he will inspire in the breasts of his associates; his social status, will vary proportionately, and no longer inversely, to his value to his fellowmen. Society will reward those best who serve it best, will penalize most severely those who serve it least effectively. Society will exert most of its pressure of praise and dispraise in harmony with, no longer in opposition to, whatever social and altruistic impulses exist within the hearts of its members. Each of us will receive outside stimulation to serve our fellows well, for therein will lie our best opportunity for personal advancement.


Such a system of reward for socially-serviceable conduct and of penalty for socially-harmful conduct provides the answer to those who loosely dismiss the Socialist program on the ground that it underestimates the need for personal stimulation by the opportunity for personal profit. This citing of Marxian materialism by the capitalist for his own purposes has been frequently and conclusively proved to be unjustified, in view of the many other impulses from within and without the individual which drive men forward to their best efforts. At all events, this point of capitalistic attack is manifestly directed at absolutist communism or at certain forms of philosophic anarchism, rather than at Socialism. For the Socialist program provides that economic reward should stimulate all in the community to their best ef-


forts as strongly as under capitalism, but with the stimulus turned in a different direction. If the defenders of the capitalist system object that the highest stimuli under Socialism might be lower, and considerably lower, in amount than the highest stimuli under Capitalism, the answer is that the Socialist state will have to raise its highest stimuli to the limit necessary to summon the most enthusiastic work of the most capable administrators. Moreover, the desire for expenditure is to a great extent competitive; among the higher incomes, expenditure is guided largely by demands of one's social class rather than by impulses and desires springing wholly, and without artificial stimulation, from within the individual.

Naturally, along with this payment of the higher remuneration for the more valuable service would proceed devastating inheritance taxes. It would be impossible for a family to dwell at ease in Zion for generations by means of whatever wealth might have been accumulated, even in a Socialist state, by the abilities of an ancestor. True, there are keen students of our social structure, such as Professor McDougall, who defend the institution of the hereditary succession to nobility in England, for instance, on the ground that in both theory and practise it personifies *Noblesse Oblige*, and hence makes possible the acceptance by the whole community of the high standards of the community's highest caste. To this point of view,

the Socialist is sympathetic. His program also calls for the sovereignty of a class that guides the community; but the system of caste under Socialism would be based on service. By their sheer inability to keep up to the standard set, the unfit would drop out; by the workings of heredity, there should nevertheless still be comparative stability in the ranks of the class which served the community most valuably from one generation to the next; the deference paid those of first rank in the state would be based on an appreciation of their value to those from whom the deference came, rather than merely on the accident of birth; and from the organization of our society as well as from whatever socializing impulses lay within us, our guiding thought in functioning as members of society would be the highest welfare of that society.







UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
BERKELEY

Return to desk from which borrowed.
This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

JUN 2 1948

3 Apr '63 LE

1 Dec 60 TD

16 Jun 51 BC

REC'D LD

Jun 16 '51 LU

MAR 25 1963

20 Apr 52 H W

LIBRARY USE

16 Apr 52 LU

MAY 3 '68

20 Nov '52 P W

RECEIVED

NOV 6 1952 LU

MAY 8 '68 -5 AM

REC'D LD

LOAN DEPT.

NOV 29 1960

YB 66305

451325

HX

86

B45-

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

